

*Rec'd Mark*

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

Published by the  
Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States.

VOLUME IV.



St. Louis:  
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE.  
1900.

20883

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. IV. .

JANUARY 1900.

No. 1.

---

## Doctrinal Theology.

---

### CHRISTOLOGY.

Christology is the doctrine of the holy Scriptures concerning the Person and the Office and Work of Christ, the Redeemer and Savior of mankind. The doctrine of Christ is not a product of human speculation, or of a process of evolution from the consciousness of the church. *Search the Scriptures*, says Christ, *for they are they which testify of me*,<sup>1)</sup> and the risen Lord himself taught his disciples from the same source; *beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself*.<sup>2)</sup> Christ is also the central subject of the New Testament. *The Gospels were written, that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ*.<sup>3)</sup> The modern distinction between the historical Christ and the Christ of Scripture is a delusion. The Christ of Moses and the prophets, the apostles and evangelists, and no other, is the historic Christ, that was, and is, and shall be. All other Christs, the Christs of Ebionites and Docetists, of Gnostics and Manichaeans, of Nestorians and Eutychians and Apollinarians, of Monophysites and Monothelites, of Socinians and other Unitarians, of Schleiermacher and Strauss and Schenkel and Renan, are caricatures or fictions,

---

1) John 5, 39.

2) Luke 24, 27.

3) John 20, 31.



false Christs, and no Christs at all. Whatever we know concerning Christ theologically, we do not know from the Annals of Tacitus,<sup>1)</sup> nor from the Antiquities of Josephus,<sup>2)</sup> Lucian's Dialogue de morte Peregrini, the fragments of Celsus, or from all these sources taken together or in addition to the sacred records, but only and solely from the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament. Neither are we to obtain our Christology by a critical study of the sacred Canon, distinguishing between a synoptical Christ, a Johannean Christ, and a Pauline Christ, between earlier and later Gospels, between original documents and the work of redactors. All such so-called historical constructions of the person and work of Christ are neither historical nor constructive, but unhistorical and destructive, and, above all, thoroughly untheological. When Simon Peter had said, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God*, Jesus answered and said unto him, *Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.*<sup>3)</sup> Even from the Scriptures a true portrait of Christ cannot be obtained but by eyes enlightened by the Spirit of God. The true knowledge of Christ is a matter of faith; it is even faith itself; and faith is the gift of God.

### I. THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

Concerning the person of Christ the Scriptures teach that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, very God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the virgin Mary, in the fullness of time, the divine nature and the human nature being from the moment of his conception for ever and inseparably united in one complete theanthropic person.

The name of this person was and is a proper name given to a certain individual in distinction from other in-

1) Tacit. Annal. XV, 44: Auctor nominis ejus Christus, qui Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat.

2) Antiquit. XVIII, 4 al.

3) Matt. 16, 16. 17.

dividuals. *Jesus* was the name given, by divine injunction, to the son of a Jewish woman of the house of David, a son whom she conceived in her womb and brought forth by birth in due time, a human child.<sup>1)</sup> But of this same son of Mary, and descendant of David,<sup>2)</sup> the same angel of the Lord who announced his conception and birth to his human mother also said, *He shall be called the Son of the Highest*,<sup>3)</sup> and his humanity and divinity are asserted in one statement of a subject and a predicate, *That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God*.<sup>4)</sup> This was the person of whose conception and birth Isaiah had prophesied seven centuries before, saying, *Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel*;<sup>5)</sup> and again, *Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; . . . and his name shall be called . . . the Mighty God, the everlasting Father*.<sup>6)</sup> Thus, *when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth HIS SON, MADE OF A WOMAN*.<sup>7)</sup> Thus from the seed of Abraham *as according to the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever*.<sup>8)</sup> When he was yet in his mother's womb, Elisabeth, being filled with the Holy Ghost,<sup>9)</sup> greeted the virgin saying, *whence is this to me, that the mother of MY LORD should come to me?*<sup>10)</sup> And in the night of his nativity the angel of the Lord pronounced him true man and true God, when his message was, *Unto you is BORN THIS DAY in the city of David a Savior, which is Christ THE LORD*.<sup>11)</sup> Thus *was the WORD made FLESH*,<sup>12)</sup> that *Word* which was in the beginning *with God*, a person distinct from another divine person, and which *was God* emphatically; *θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος*, very God, as the Father, in divine essence, though distinct

1) Luke 1, 31; 2, 5—7. 21. Matt. 1, 18—25.

2) Luke 1, 32. *The throne of his father David.*

3) Luke 1, 32.

4) Luke 1, 35.

5) Is. 7, 14.

6) Is. 9, 6.

7) Gal. 4, 4.

8) Rom. 9, 5.

9) Luke 1, 41.

10) Luke 1, 43.

11) Luke 2, 11.

12) John 1, 14.



from him in person.<sup>1)</sup> Thus, too, was he known and acknowledged by his disciples. When he had asked them, *Whom do men say that I THE SON OF MAN am?* they quoted the false opinions of such as took him to be mere man. But when he asked, *Whom say ye that I am?* Simon Peter in their name answered, *Thou art the Christ, the SON OF THE LIVING GOD.*<sup>2)</sup> And this was also the doctrine of Christ concerning himself. He does not rebuke Peter, but approves of his reply and profession, saying, *Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.*<sup>3)</sup> And not to Peter alone had the Father revealed the divine Sonship of the Son of man, but also to others. Thus when he was come from Galilee where he had lived the humble life of a carpenter's foster-son, and was baptized in Jordan as other children of Abraham according to the flesh,<sup>4)</sup> the Father's voice from heaven said of the man Jesus, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased!*<sup>5)</sup> Of him the psalmist had said in his name, *The Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee;*<sup>6)</sup> and the Epistle to the Hebrews, speaking of the first-born whom the Father brought into the world,<sup>7)</sup> the man Jesus,<sup>8)</sup> our brother and kinsman,<sup>9)</sup> who took on him the seed of Abraham and was in all things made like unto his brethren,<sup>10)</sup> refers to those words of the psalmist as testifying to his superiority to men and angels, saying, *Unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee?*<sup>11)</sup>

These are a few of a multitude of texts which show that the uniform doctrine of the Scriptures, of both Testaments, of prophets and apostles, of angels and arch-angels, of the Father and the Holy Ghost, and of Christ himself,

---

1) John 1, 11.

4) Matt. 3, 9. 13.

7) Hebr. 1, 6.

10) Hebr. 2, 14—17.

2) Matt. 16, 13—16.

5) Matt. 3, 16. 17.

8) Hebr. 2, 6. 9.

11) Hebr. 1, 5. Cf. vv. 2—13.

3) Matt. 16, 17.

6) Ps. 2, 7.

9) Hebr. 2, 11 ff.

sets forth the *θεανδρωπος* as true man and very God in one person, Jesus, the Christ.

There is, then, in Christ, a duality of natures. Christ is not an apotheosized man, a human person who at some time or by some process of development had been elevated to divine dignity. Such a concept would involve a contradiction in itself, incompatible with the true notions both of humanity and of divinity, and with the notion of nature itself. A nature, *φύσις*, is what it is by its origin, and though it may pass out of existence, it can, while it exists, never be essentially anything else than what it is by its origin. A creature can never be anything in itself but a creature, and a creature of its kind. A human being can, by its nature, never be essentially anything but a human being. It can never, by deterioration, degenerate into a brute; neither can it, by development, be changed into an angel or a god. But the development of a human into a divine being is equally and even more incompatible with the notion of divinity. A divine nature which was not at all times and from everlasting essentially divine would be a logical and metaphysical nonentity, lacking the attributes of immutability and eternity, which are of the very essence of God.<sup>1)</sup> To adore such a god would be idolatry, the worship of a god besides the one true God. But of Christ we read, *When he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.*<sup>2)</sup> Of the Word which was made flesh, it is said, *In the beginning WAS the Word. The same was in the beginning with God.*<sup>3)</sup> According to his divine nature, Jesus says, *Before Abraham was, I am,*<sup>4)</sup> and, *O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.*<sup>5)</sup> Not by temporal deification, but by eternal genera-

1) Mal. 3, 6. James 1, 17. Exod. 3, 14. Ps. 102, 26. 27. — Gen. 21, 33. Is. 40, 28.

2) Hebr. 1, 6.

3) John 1, 1. 2.

4) John 8, 58.

5) John 17, 5.



tion, Jesus, according to his divine nature, was the true God, of whom the Father said, *This day have I begotten thee,*<sup>1)</sup> and, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.*<sup>2)</sup> Thus, also, the scriptural statements, to the effect that *all things were made by the Word which was made flesh,*<sup>3)</sup> and that the Son by whom God in these last days hath spoken to us is he, *by whom also he made the worlds,*<sup>4)</sup> are so many assertions of a divine nature in Christ which was for ever and at all times divine, of the same essence with the Father and the Holy Ghost, God, the Maker of heaven and earth.<sup>5)</sup> Jesus, according to his divine nature, is not a son of God by adoption, but he whom God gave for the salvation of the world was *his only begotten Son.*<sup>6)</sup> The Word made flesh was *the only begotten of the Father,*<sup>7)</sup> *the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father.*<sup>8)</sup> In the incarnation of the Logos, *God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.*<sup>9)</sup> Thus was *God in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,*<sup>10)</sup> *God manifest in the flesh,*<sup>11)</sup> who, because of the unity of his essence with that of the Father could truly say, *I and my Father are one,*<sup>12)</sup> and, *He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.*<sup>13)</sup> Thus it is that, being in Christ, *we are in him that is true, even in HIS SON Jesus Christ. This is the TRUE GOD and eternal life.*<sup>14)</sup> A Christology which conceives of the divinity of Christ in any other than this scriptural sense is, as, f. ex., the theory of modern kenotists and the doctrine of the Socinians and other Unitarians, a polytheistic scheme void of a truly divine Christ sufficient to make atonement for the sins of the world.

On the other hand, as the one nature in Christ, his divine nature, is and ever was truly and essentially divine,

1) Ps. 2, 7; coll. Hebr. 1, 5.

2) Ps. 45, 6; coll. Hebr. 1, 8.

3) John 1, 3. Cf. Col. 1, 16.

4) Hebr. 1, 1. 2.

5) Gen. 1 ff. Ps. 33, 6. Jer. 32, 17. Ps. 104, 24; 136, 5. Rev. 4, 11.

6) John 3, 16.

7) John 1, 14.

8) John 1, 18.

9) 1 John 4, 9.

10) 2 Cor. 5, 19.

11) 1 Tim. 3, 16.

12) John 10, 30.

13) John 14, 9.

14) 1 John 5, 20.



so the other nature in the person of Christ, his human nature, is and from its conception was essentially human, consisting of a human body and a human rational soul, with its own human intelligence, will, and affections, in all essentials a nature like our own. According to this nature he is expressly called *the MAN Christ Jesus*.<sup>1)</sup> Again and again he calls himself *the son of man*.<sup>2)</sup> According to this nature he who was, according to his divine nature, *the Son of God* and *declared to be the Son of God with power*, was *made of the seed of David according to the flesh*,<sup>3)</sup> as he had been promised of old, *the Lord* our righteousness, *raised unto David a righteous branch*,<sup>4)</sup> David's Lord and Son.<sup>5)</sup> According to this nature the Son of God was *made of a woman*,<sup>6)</sup> conceived in the womb, born in due time, wrapped in swaddling clothes, laid in a manger, circumcised, reared through childhood and boyhood into manhood at Nazareth.<sup>7)</sup> He had a human body,<sup>8)</sup> flesh and blood as other children of men,<sup>9)</sup> and a human soul or spirit,<sup>10)</sup> a human understanding capable of natural growth,<sup>11)</sup> a human will distinct from the divine will,<sup>12)</sup> and human affections and emotions.<sup>13)</sup> He suffered hunger<sup>14)</sup> and thirst<sup>15)</sup> and fatigue<sup>16)</sup> and pain<sup>17)</sup> and temptation,<sup>18)</sup> lived a human life,<sup>19)</sup> and died a human death, the separation of body and soul.<sup>20)</sup>

---

1) 1 Tim. 2, 5.

2) Matt. 2, 6; 16, 13. Luke 9, 56; 21, 27. al.

3) Rom. 1, 3. 4. 4) Jer. 23, 5. 6.

5) Matt. 22, 42. 43. 6) Gal. 4, 4.

7) Matt. 1, 18 ff. Luke 1, 31; 2, 1—52.

8) John 2, 21. Matt. 26, 12. 36.

9) Hebr. 2, 14. 10) Matt. 26, 38. Luke 10, 21; 23, 46.

11) Luke 2, 52. 12) Luke 22, 42.

13) John 11, 33. 35; 13, 27. Luke 10, 21; 19, 41; 22, 15. Matt. 26, 38. Mark 3, 5; 10, 21.

14) Matt. 4, 2; 21, 18. 15) John 19, 28. 16) John 4, 6.

17) Hebr. 5, 8; 2, 10. Luke 22, 43. 44.

18) Matt. 4, 1 ff. Hebr. 2, 18.

19) John 10, 15. 17. Luke 22, 44.

20) John 19, 30. Matt. 27, 50. Luke 23, 46.

As his divine nature is truly divine from everlasting to everlasting, so his human nature is truly human, having had a human beginning at a certain period of time, in the days of Herod, the king of Judaea,<sup>1)</sup> during the reign of Caesar Augustus,<sup>2)</sup> when the fulness of the time was come.<sup>3)</sup> A pre-existing human nature would be no truly human nature, derived from the common stock of mankind, no nature which would have constituted a substitute for the human race to mediate between God and man. Neither would an incomplete human nature, a nature void of the rational human soul, as Apollinaris of old, and of the moderns Gess and H. W. Beecher, would have it, answer the purpose of the incarnation. A redeemer thus constituted, in whom the Logos had taken the place of the *ψυχὴ λογική*, would have been incompetent to ransom the human soul. Besides, the *λόγος* of these kenotists is not the *λόγος* of Scripture, their Christ not a Christ in whom all the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily. Their Christ is void of true humanity as well as of true divinity.

But while two complete and distinct natures are united in Christ, this duality of natures must not be construed into a duality of persons. There is in Christ but one personality, that of the divine nature, which subsisted by itself as a person distinct from the Father from eternity. Thus in the psalm, the Son speaks of himself in the first person, and *to* the Father in the second person, and is *spoken to* by the Father in the second person, the Father speaking of himself in the first.<sup>4)</sup> Nothing of the kind occurs between the human and the divine natures of Christ. The human nature of Christ never subsisted by itself with a personality of its own distinct from that of the divine nature. When the human nature of Christ was conceived in the virgin's womb, it was at once in personal union with the Logos, the second

1) Luke 1, 5. 26.

2) Luke 2, 1 ff.

3) Gal. 4, 4.

4) Ps. 2, 7. The Lord hath said unto *me*, *Thou art my Son*, this day have *I* begotten *thee*.

Person in the Trinity. *The Word was made flesh,*<sup>1)</sup> when the virgin conceived, and the angel does not say, "Thy son shall be united with the Son of God," but *that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.*<sup>2)</sup> Neither does St. Paul say, "God sent his Son to be united with the son of a woman," but, *God sent his Son, made of a woman.*<sup>3)</sup> Mary was not the mother of a human person with whom at some later period the divine person of the Son of God was to unite himself, but she was the mother of God, *θεοτόκος*, when Elisabeth greeted her as *the mother of her Lord,*<sup>4)</sup> even before the child was born of whom she said, *Blessed is the fruit of thy womb.*<sup>5)</sup> The same Christ who as concerning the flesh came from Israel, is over all God blessed for ever.<sup>6)</sup> The person Jesus Christ, who is the Son of God, our Lord, *was made of the seed of David according to the flesh.*<sup>7)</sup> When Jesus, speaking of himself in the first person singular, *I, the Son of man*, asked the disciples, *Whom say ye that I am?* Simon Peter addresses him in the second person singular, *Thou, the son of man, art the Christ, the Son of the living God.* And while the incarnate Son distinguishes between his person and that of the Father and that of the Holy Ghost, speaking *to* the Father in the second, and *of* the Father and of the Holy Ghost in the third person,<sup>8)</sup> he invariably speaks of himself as one person. As the God-man he says, *My Father, my kingdom, my life, my body, my soul, my spirit, my blood, my hands and my feet, my brethren, my disciples, my love.* When Jesus touched the bier and said, *Young man, I say unto thee, Arise,* it was the one person, the God-man, speaking with his human lips the word of his divine omnipotence

1) John 1, 14.

2) Luke 1, 35.

3) Gal. 4, 4.

4) Luke 1, 43.

5) Luke 1, 42.

6) Rom. 9, 5.

7) Rom. 1, 3.

8) John 17, 5. And now, *O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* Cf. Luke 22, 42; 23, 46. John 20, 17. — Matt. 12, 28. John 15, 26.



which caused him that was dead to sit up and live.<sup>1)</sup> And when Jesus cried with a loud voice and said, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit*,<sup>2)</sup> it was the one theanthropic Savior who gave up his human life and soul as a ransom for all mankind, *obtaining an eternal redemption for us*,<sup>3)</sup> and *by one offering perfecting for ever them that are sanctified*,<sup>4)</sup> because he who was born in the city of David a Savior was Christ the Lord. Being true God, yet not the Father nor the Holy Ghost, the man Christ Jesus was able to be a mediator between God and men, who gave himself a ransom for all.<sup>5)</sup> This is the mystery of the Immanuel, *God manifest in the flesh*.<sup>6)</sup> Thus it is that, though the two natures personally united in Christ are and remain essentially distinct, each retaining its own essential properties or attributes, its own intelligence and will, so that his divinity is not his humanity nor a part thereof, nor his humanity his divinity, that while there is in him no mixture or confusion of natures, there is in Christ a communion of natures, so that the divine nature is the nature of the Son of man, and the human nature the nature of the Son of God. When the Son of God *took on him the seed of Abraham*, by this assumption of the human nature into the unity of the person of the Son of God, a person was constituted in whom thenceforth for all time and eternity God is man<sup>7)</sup> and man is God,<sup>8)</sup> the *concretum* of the one nature being predicable of the *concretum* of the other. Since the incarnation of the λόγος there is in heaven and earth no Son of God without a human nature, the human nature made from the blood of the Virgin. That human nature was and is, from its conception at all times and everywhere, in the Virgin's womb, in the manger, in the desert, on the mount of transfiguration, in Geth-

1) Luke 7, 14 f.

2) Luke 24, 46.

3) Hebr. 9, 12.

4) Hebr. 10, 14.

5) 1 Tim. 2, 5. 6.

6) 1 Tim. 3, 16.

7) Gal. 4, 4. John 1, 14. Rom. 1, 3.

8) 1 Cor. 15, 47. The second man is the Lord from heaven. Cf. Jer. 23, 5. 6. Matt. 16, 13. 16.

semane, on the cross, in the sepulchre, in Paradise and in hell, and at the right hand of Glory, without cessation or intermission and in precisely the same sense, the nature of the Son of God, so inseparably united with the Godhead, that in Bethlehem the Lord, the Son of God was born,<sup>1)</sup> and on Calvary God's own blood was shed<sup>2)</sup> and the Son of God suffered an ignominious death.<sup>3)</sup>

This union and communion of the two natures in Christ is without analogy in nature or history. It is a wonderful work of God in plan and execution, far above human comprehension, a mystery which the prophets to whom it was revealed were unable to fathom, and which *the angels desire to look into*.<sup>4)</sup> But what is above human comprehension is not necessarily contrary to human reason. While the false, unscriptural Christologies are largely untenable, not only theologically, but also logically, involving contradictions *in se* and *in appposito*, notions of a divinity which is not divine and of a humanity which is not human, there is no logical impossibility in the doctrine of Scripture concerning the person of Christ. There is, on the contrary, a divine logic, an inherent sequence and consistency, in scriptural Christology which, while not a problem of human speculation, but a matter of divine revelation, is clearly set forth by the holy men of God in the Scriptures for our instruction, that, when we read, we may understand their knowledge in the mystery of Christ.<sup>5)</sup>

Thus, the personal union and the communion of natures thus established in Christ, forms the basis of an intercommunication of attributes between the natures personally united in the God-man. Though in the person of Christ each nature retains its essential attributes unchanged and

---

1) Luke 2, 11. Gal. 4, 4.

2) Acts 20, 28. The church of *God* which he hath purchased with *his own blood*. Cf. 1 John 1, 7.

3) Rom. 5, 10. We were reconciled to God by *the death of his Son*.

4) 1 Pet. 1, 10—12.

5) Eph. 3, 3, 4.

undiminished in kind and number, the human attributes remaining the essential attributes of the human nature, and the divine attributes remaining the essential attributes of the divine nature, yet each nature also communicates its attributes to the other in the personal union, so that the divine nature participates in properties of the human nature, and the human nature in those of the divine nature.

The retention of its peculiar attributes by each nature is consistent with the notion of a nature, *φύσις*, according to which a subject is what it is essentially by its origin. That τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σὰρξ ἐστίν,<sup>1)</sup> holds good, not only as applied to the deteriorated and corrupt human nature of natural man, but is also applicable to the holy and undefiled human nature of Christ, inasmuch as that which was taken from the substance of the virgin mother is and remains σὰρξ in the sense in which the Word was made flesh, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο,<sup>2)</sup> a truly human nature with human properties. It is proper to human nature to be descended from a human ancestor; and we read that Christ *was made of the seed of David* ACCORDING TO THE FLESH,<sup>3)</sup> and that from Israel *as according to the flesh Christ came.*<sup>4)</sup> It is proper, not to the divine nature, but to the human nature, to suffer and to die; and we read that Christ suffered and was put to death *in the flesh.*<sup>5)</sup> But these same properties of the human nature are also ascribed to the *concretum* of the divine nature, when we read that we are reconciled to God by *the death of his Son,*<sup>6)</sup> that the *Lord of glory was crucified,*<sup>7)</sup> and the *Prince of life was killed,*<sup>8)</sup> that God purchased his church with *his own blood.*<sup>9)</sup> Again, omnipotence is a divine attribute; yet it is ascribed to the human nature of Christ when he says, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth;*<sup>10)</sup> for according to the divine nature he had all power from eternity.

---

1) John 3, 6.	2) John 1, 14.	3) Rom. 1, 3.	4) Rom. 9, 5.
5) 1 Pet. 4, 1; 3, 18.	6) Rom. 5, 10.	}	7) 1 Cor. 2, 8.
8) Acts 3, 15.	9) Acts 20, 28.		10) Matt. 28, 18.



The statements of Scripture teaching the *communicatio idiomatum* are of three kinds, or *genera*, which, according to the accepted terminology are *genus idiomaticum*, *genus majestaticum s. auchematicum*, and *genus apotelesmaticum*.

The statements of the *genus idiomaticum* are those whereby attributes of either nature are ascribed to the entire person of Christ, divine attributes are ascribed to the *concretum* of his human nature, and human attributes are ascribed to the *concretum* of his divine nature. To the entire person, Jesus Christ, the divine attribute of immutability is ascribed in the words, *Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.*<sup>1)</sup> Peter, speaking to Christ, says, *Lord, thou knowest all things,*<sup>2)</sup> ascribing to the entire person spoken to the divine attribute of omniscience, and Christ accepts the statement. St. Paul attributes to the entire person of Christ both human and divine properties when he says, *Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.*<sup>3)</sup> For to come or be descended according to the flesh is human, and to be over all and blessed for ever are divine prerogatives. — Again, of the *concretum* of the human nature, the *Son of man*, Christ himself predicates heavenly descent and omnipresence, and the divine power to forgive sins, when he says, *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven,*<sup>4)</sup> and, *The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins.*<sup>5)</sup> On the other hand, predicates or attributes proper to the human nature are ascribed to the *concretum* of the divine nature; the Son of God. For to be made of a woman, or born of a human mother, or to be descended from a human ancestor, to have blood, to be delivered up, to be crucified, killed, and raised from the dead, are properties, not of the divine, but of the human nature; yet they are, as communicated attributes, ascribed to the Son of God, the Word, the Lord of glory, the Prince

1) Hebr. 13, 8.

2) John 21, 17.

3) Rom. 9, 5.

4) John 3, 13. Cf. John 6, 62.

5) Matt. 9, 6.

of life, the *concretum* of the divine nature in Christ, in statements as these:—God sent forth HIS SON, *made of a woman*.<sup>1)</sup> HIS SON Jesus Christ our Lord, which was *made of the seed of David according to the flesh*.<sup>2)</sup> The WORD was *made flesh*.<sup>3)</sup> Who . . . hath translated us into the kingdom of HIS DEAR SON: in whom we have redemption through *his blood*.<sup>4)</sup> He hath not spared HIS OWN SON, but *delivered him up* for us all.<sup>5)</sup> They would not have *crucified* the LORD OF GLORY.<sup>6)</sup> Ye *killed* the PRINCE OF LIFE, whom God hath *raised from the dead*.<sup>7)</sup>—In all these cases, the *concretum* of either nature stands for the entire person named from such nature, and the personal union whereby the nature furnishing the name is united with the nature furnishing the attribute is the basis of the communication of attributes indicated by the propositions grouped under this head.

The propositions of the *genus majesticum s. auchematicum*<sup>8)</sup> as these terms indicate, deal with a particular class of attributes, the divine attributes showing forth the glory of the Only-begotten of the Father. Though the human nature of the person of Christ remains truly human, yet all the divine properties and perfections and the honor and glory thereto pertaining are as truly communicated to his human nature, so that the divine perfections which the divine nature has as essential attributes, the human nature has communicated attributes. In Christ *dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*.<sup>9)</sup> This statement is very emphatic. The apostle does not say, as he might have said, that in Christ dwelleth *the Godhead*, but he says, the *fulness of the Godhead*, and *ALL the fulness of the Godhead*. He in whom the fulness of the Godhead is here, as in 1, 19, said to dwell is *Christ*, the theanthropic person.

1) Gal. 4, 4.

2) Rom. 1, 3.

3) John 1, 14.

4) Col. 1, 13. 14.

5) Rom. 8, 32.

6) 1 Cor. 2, 8.

7) Acts 3, 15.

8) *Αύχημα* = splendor, glory.

9) Col. 2, 9. Ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς.

But when the fulness of the Godhead is said to *dwell in Christ*, the concept of Christ is by prevalence that of the *human Christ*, the *Son of man*, the *man Christ Jesus*,<sup>1)</sup> since in the Son of God as such the fulness of the Godhead would not be said to *dwell*, the Son *being* himself the brightness of God's glory and the express image of his person.<sup>2)</sup> But when *God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself*,<sup>3)</sup> it *pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself*.<sup>4)</sup> Here again it appears that he in whom all the fulness should dwell is primarily conceived as the Son of man, Christ according to that nature, according to which he was crucified and shed his blood on the cross. And in this sense, the fulness of the Godhead is said to dwell in Christ *σωματικῶς*, *bodily*, *God manifest in the flesh*,<sup>5)</sup> or, according to St. John, the *Word made flesh*,<sup>6)</sup> *which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life*.<sup>7)</sup> And now, to this visible and palpable Christ, who says, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth*,<sup>8)</sup> not one divine attribute only, that of omnipotence, was given or communicated, but the fulness of the Godhead, and that without curtailment or restriction, but *all*, *ALL* the fulness of the Godhead. And how could it be otherwise? *The Lord our God is one Lord*.<sup>9)</sup> The Godhead is indivisible. Every attribute of God is God whole and entire. Where omnipotence is, there is also omniscience. And thus, he unto whom all power is given, also knoweth all things,<sup>10)</sup> knows all men and what is in man;<sup>11)</sup> *in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge*.<sup>12)</sup> And with omnipotence and omniscience, omnipresence also is communicated. Christ, the head of the church, *filleth*

1) 1 Tim. 2, 5.

2) Hebr. 1, 3.

3) 2 Cor. 5, 19.

4) Col. 1, 19, 20.

5) 1 Tim. 3, 16.

6) John 1, 14.

7) 1 John 1, 1; cf. 4, 14.

8) Matt. 28, 18.

9) Deut. 6, 4.

10) John 21, 17.

11) John 2, 24, 25.

12) Col. 2, 3.



*all in all;*<sup>1)</sup> where two or three are gathered together in his name, there is he in the midst of them.<sup>2)</sup> By virtue of the personal union, the Son of man, while he walked on earth and was closeted with Nicodemus, was also in heaven,<sup>3)</sup> even as now, being ascended into heaven, he, the son of man, is with his church on earth even unto the end of the world.<sup>4)</sup> Nor are the quiescent or intransitive attributes, indivisibility, immutability, infinity, excluded from this communication of the fulness of the Godhead to the man Christ Jesus. While the operative or transitive attributes are communicated directly and immediately, so that the man Jesus is thereby constituted an omnipotent man, the quiescent attributes are communicated indirectly or mediately, through and with the operative attributes of life, wisdom, holiness, power, love, etc., there being in the man Christ Jesus eternal life, infinite wisdom, immutable holiness and righteousness, boundless power, love indivisible and everlasting as God himself.<sup>5)</sup> And hence, *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory.*<sup>6)</sup> To him who was *made in the likeness of men*, but was, at the same time, *in the form of God*, *God has given a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.*<sup>7)</sup> In this the Father did not set up a new God; *for his glory he will not give to another.*<sup>8)</sup> But Christ is not another, *ἄλλος*, also according to his human nature, which is the nature, by assumption, of the Son of God, personally united with the Godhead and, in such union, entitled to divine honor. Not by its exaltation, whereof the apostle here speaks, was the human nature of Christ

1) Eph. 1, 23.

2) Matt. 18, 20.

3) John 3, 13.

4) Matt. 28, 20.

5) 1 John 5, 20. John 17, 2. Col. 2, 3. John 14, 6. Matt. 28, 18. Phil. 3, 21. 1 John 4, 16.

6) Rev. 5, 12.

7) Phil. 2, 7. 9. 10.

8) Is. 42, 8; 48, 11.

endowed with divine majesty, but the glory which the eternal Son had with the Father before the world was,<sup>1)</sup> and the divine majesty which was communicated to the human nature in the incarnation of the Logos, was shown forth and proclaimed to angels and men, God himself giving him a name above every name, whereby he should be known in heaven and earth and under the earth in accordance with what he truly was and had been, though for a time obscured by his deep humiliation, and knowing which *every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord.*<sup>2)</sup> It must never be forgotten, that the communication of attributes has place only in and by virtue of the personal union. The divine attributes are and remain properly those of the divine nature and are not transferred to or infused into the human nature. The human nature in Christ is not endowed with an omnipotence properly its own, and the adoration of the flesh of Christ as separate from his divine nature would be the idolatrous worship of a creature just as the adoration of the host in the mass. The divine majesty ascribed to the human nature in Christ is that of the divine nature, which, taking the human nature into its divine personality, communicated all its attributes to a nature which is and remains essentially human with human essential properties only, while the divine attributes remain the essential attributes of the divine nature only. Again, inasmuch as the communication of divine majesty to the human nature is based only on the personal union with the divine nature, such communication was not gradual or progressive, not a *donum superadditum* bestowed upon Christ in his exaltation, but took place at once when the personal union was established in the incarnation, when the God-man was conceived in the womb.<sup>3)</sup> The babe in the manger-cradle at Bethlehem was Christ the Lord,<sup>4)</sup> the Ruler of the universe,

1) John 17, 5.

2) Phil. 2, 11.

3) Luke 1, 35. 43.

4) Luke 2, 11.

not by exaltation; for the Godhead cannot be exalted and the human nature had not been exalted, but stooped in deep humiliation, feeble and poor and despised and rejected of men; yet the LORD, inasmuch as what was human in that babe had been received into the personality of and was personally united with the divine nature of the Son of God. By that personal union, all the fulness of the Godhead dwelled bodily in the human child in Simeon's arms, divine power and wisdom and holiness truly communicated to a nature which was and remained in all its essentials truly and exclusively human. And by virtue of the same personal union established in the humble conception of Mary's child, but established for all time and eternity thenceforth, our own brother and kinsman according to the flesh, as truly man as when he lay in swaddling clothes, is, also according to his human nature, by the communication of attributes essential only to the divine nature, endowed with divine omnipotence, able to fulfill his promise, *I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world*,<sup>1)</sup> and to work his will according to his word, *This is my body, this is my blood*, wherever his sacrament is administered.

Among the divine perfections communicated to the human nature of Christ one has been mentioned which should receive our special and particular attention before we proceed to the next group of *propositiones idiomaticae*. It is the immutable, infinite holiness, according to which Christ is called God's *Holy One*.<sup>2)</sup> The Holy One of Israel is the Lord, the Maker of heaven and earth and of all the wondrous works of God.<sup>3)</sup> But when the psalmist says, *Neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption*, the term, Holy One, is evidently applied to the God-man, and, more especially, to that nature according to which he had flesh which rested in hope,<sup>4)</sup> and, according to which, if he had not been God's Holy One, he might have

---

1) Matt. 28, 20.

3) Is. 41, 20; cf. 6, 13.

2) Ps. 16, 10. Acts 2, 27.

4) Ps. 16, 9.



seen corruption. So when the divine messenger describes the incarnate Son of God as τὸ γεννώμενον ἄγιον, *the Holy thing born*,<sup>1)</sup> the child of the virgin is thereby distinguished from all other children of men. The human nature of Christ was in itself *holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners*,<sup>2)</sup> *in him is no sin*,<sup>3)</sup> and he *knew no sin*.<sup>4)</sup> There was in the man Jesus no taint of original or hereditary sin, and *he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; when he was reviled, he reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not*.<sup>5)</sup> But there was in the man Jesus more than human holiness and righteousness. The angels of God are holy angels, and there are in heaven *the spirits of just men made perfect*.<sup>6)</sup> But our high priest, who in his human holiness is separate from sinners, was *made higher than the heavens*,<sup>7)</sup> also in his holiness. By the personal union the essential holiness of the Son of God was made the communicated holiness of the man Jesus. By this communicated holiness he was, according to his human nature, not only sinless, but absolutely impeccable. *As it is impossible for God to lie*,<sup>8)</sup> so it is impossible for Christ to sin. This does not exclude temptability in Christ. The human nature in Christ remained truly and essentially human and as such could be and was exposed to temptation.<sup>9)</sup> When Christ was assailed by the tempter, he was truly tempted; *he was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin*. When Satan tempted Christ, he laid siege to an impregnable fortress. When he tempted Eve, he was shrewd and subtil;<sup>10)</sup> when he tempted Christ, he was a fool, though he went at his work with satanic cunning exhibited in the mode and manner of his onslaughts;<sup>11)</sup> for he failed to consider the difference between the woman in Paradise and the Seed of the woman in the desert, that the former was merely

1) Luke 1, 35.

2) Hebr. 7, 26.

3) 1 John 3, 5.

4) 2 Cor. 5, 21.

5) 1 Pet. 2, 22 f.

6) Hebr. 12, 23.

7) Hebr. 7, 26.

8) Hebr. 6, 18.

9) Matt. 4, 1 ff.

10) Gen. 3, 1.

11) Matt. 4, 3. 6. 8. 9.

human, and the latter truly human, but at the same time the Son of God. Hence, while the woman was deceived<sup>1)</sup> and the woman succumbed, it was impossible to deceive and overcome the Seed of the woman who was omniscient and omnipotent. While the temptation in both cases was truly and really temptation, the resistance was different; and hence the difference in the outcome, defeat in the one case, where it was victory in the other. Thus the Captain of our salvation is in every way fitted to be our champion and substitute; our champion, who was truly assailed and in every way victorious; our substitute, who was truly made under the law given to man and yet the Lord, not only of the Sabbath,<sup>2)</sup> but of the entire law; *on* him the sin of all the world, *in* him no sin of any kind, nor even a possibility of sin; made a curse for us,<sup>3)</sup> though the beloved Son of God, in whom the Father is well pleased,<sup>4)</sup> and in whom all nations shall be blessed.<sup>5)</sup>

It now remains to consider the statements of the third class, the *genus apotelesmaticum*. Ἀποτέλεσμα is the performance of a task, the achievement of a purpose. The personal union of the two natures in Christ, or the assumption of the human nature by the divine nature into personal union with itself was not a matter of absolute necessity. It was not a part of the execution of the plan or decree of creation, but a measure pertaining to the plan and decree of redemption. The theosophical tenet entertained by earlier mystics and widely advocated among modern theologians, the supposition of an incarnation of the Deity by way or for the purpose of a consummation of the work of creation with a view of providing for mankind a unifying head, Christ, the second Adam, "the goal and crown of the entire creation of God," is not only ἀγραφον, but ἀντίγραφον. The question, *Cur Deus homo?* is explicitly answered in

1) 1 Tim. 2, 14.

2) Matt. 12, 8.

3) Gal. 3, 13.

4) Matt. 3, 17.

5) Gal. 3, 8, 14. Cf. Gen. 12, 2. al.

the Scriptures. The *πρωτευαγγέλιον* sets forth the task allotted to the Seed of the woman, *to bruise the head of the serpent*,<sup>1)</sup> and the last apostle writes, *For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil*.<sup>2)</sup> Saint Paul tells us that *God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons*.<sup>3)</sup> And the God-man himself states the purpose of his mission, saying that *God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life*,<sup>4)</sup> and that *the Son of man is come to save that which was lost*.<sup>5)</sup> The very name of the incarnate Son of God indicates this purpose, the name given him according to the divine message, *Thou shalt call his name JESUS; for he shall save his people from their sins*.<sup>6)</sup>

The purpose of the incarnation of the Logos, then, was the redemption and salvation of mankind. *Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved*.<sup>7)</sup> Among men there could not be found a savior. *None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him*.<sup>8)</sup> Neither could an angel or archangel mediate between God and man, fulfilling the law and bearing the sins of the world. Man had sinned and man must suffer the penalty of sin; to man the law was given and by man it must be fulfilled. Therefore the Mediator must be man as they whose place he must take in obedience and in the judgment. But the redemption of the world was a task too great for a mere man, who could not have become the substitute for one of his brethren, much less a ransom for all, *perfecting by one offering for ever them that are sanctified*.<sup>9)</sup> Therefore such a High priest became us, who

1) Gen. 3, 15.

2) 1 John 3, 8.

3) Gal. 4, 4.

4) John 3, 16.

5) Matt. 18, 11.

6) Matt. 1, 21. 25. Luke 1, 31; 2, 21.

7) Acts 4, 12.

8) Ps. 49, 7.

9) Hebr. 10, 14.

is *higher than the heavens*.<sup>1)</sup> And such a Savior is Christ, the Son of God and Son of man. He to whom the Father said, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*,<sup>2)</sup> took part of human flesh and blood, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil,<sup>3)</sup> was made *like unto his brethren*, that he might make *reconciliation for the sins of the people*.<sup>4)</sup>

But Christ was not made unto us righteousness and redemption only, but also wisdom and sanctification.<sup>5)</sup> He was to be not only our Priest, but also our Prophet<sup>6)</sup> and our King,<sup>7)</sup> to preach the gospel, to teach by precept and example, to rule his people as the Head and the Bridegroom of his church. For this threefold office he was anointed,<sup>8)</sup> Priest, Prophet, and King, and thus was and is he *ὁ Χριστός, the Christ*.<sup>9)</sup>

In the administration of his office and the execution of the works thereto pertaining, Christ, the God-man, was and is active, exerting the energies of the entire theanthropic person, both natures concurring in such works, each performing in communion with the other what is proper to itself. It is human, not divine, to die; but while to die was proper to one nature, the human nature, only, the entire person, *Christ*, is said to have *died for our sins*.<sup>10)</sup> And not only that, but the concurrence of the two natures in the acts of either nature is such that what is and remains proper to one nature is predicated of or ascribed to the other nature. To the *Son of man* it was proper to *give his life a ransom for many*; <sup>11)</sup> yet we read that *we were reconciled to God by THE DEATH OF HIS SON*,<sup>12)</sup> and that *the blood of*

1) Hebr. 7, 26.

2) Ps. 2, 7. Hebr. 1, 5.

3) Hebr. 2, 14.

4) Hebr. 2, 17.

5) 1 Cor. 1, 30.

6) Deut. 18, 18. Acts 3, 22. John 6, 14.

7) Dan. 7, 14. Jer. 23, 5. 6. John 8, 37.

8) Dan. 9, 25. 26. Ps. 2, 2. Is. 61, 1. Acts 10, 38.

9) Luke 2, 26. Matt. 16, 16. John 20, 31. Acts 2, 31.

10) 1 Cor. 15, 3. Cf. Gal. 1, 4. Eph. 5, 2.

11) Matt. 20, 28. Cf. 1 Tim. 2, 5. 6.

12) Rom. 5, 10. Cf. 8, 32.



*Jesus Christ HIS SON cleanseth us from all sin.*<sup>1)</sup> Of the *Seed of the woman* the first prophecy said both that he should bruise the serpent's head, and that the serpent should bruise his heel;<sup>2)</sup> and when he was come and had suffered and died, the apostle, describing the fulfillment of the prophecy, ascribes the work of the Seed of the woman to the Son of God: *For this purpose the SON OF GOD was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.* The natures in Christ had not entered into a partnership for the performance of a common purpose, each partner contributing toward the common work that of which he himself was capable, as a mason and a carpenter may build a house, each performing his share of the work according to his trade. When Jesus said, *Young man, I say unto thee, Arise,*<sup>3)</sup> those words were human words pronounced with human organs of speech, and he who spoke them was the man Jesus. But a thousand men and tenthousand human voices could not have produced the effect which followed, could not have roused the widow's son. When Jesus spoke, *I say unto thee*, it was the God-man who spoke; and the will that was expressed by the command, *Arise*, was not a human will only, but at the same time and concurrently the will of the living God; and the power exerted through that word, *Arise*, was Omnipotence divine, even as that human word itself was a word of God as truly as the word, *Let there be light*, at the beginning of time. Thus, also, in the work of redemption, the obedience of the child Jesus and his subjection to his parents<sup>4)</sup> was a fulfillment of the fourth commandment rendered by the Son of God. And thus in all things, being made under the law,<sup>5)</sup> Christ, the God-man rendered obedience to all the commandments of God, loving the Father with all his heart and loving his brethren more than himself.<sup>6)</sup> In such obe-

1) 1 John 1, 7. Cf. Acts 20, 28.

2) Gen. 3, 15.

3) Luke 7, 11.

4) Luke 2, 51.

5) Gal. 4, 4.

6) John 14, 31. John 13, 1.

dience the Son of God, made under the law, abundantly satisfied the law and procured a righteousness sufficient in the sight of God, that *by the obedience of one the many might be made righteous.*<sup>1)</sup> And when he became *obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,*<sup>2)</sup> such suffering of body and soul was undergone by that nature to which alone it was proper to suffer and die, but with the concurrence of the divine nature personally united with the human nature; for the hands and feet that were pierced, and the face that was smitten, and the head that was crowned with thorns, and the soul that was exceeding sorrowful, were the hands and feet, the face and brow, and the human soul, of the Son of God, who thus suffered and died and *made propitiation for the sins of the whole world.*<sup>3)</sup> While a mere God could not have suffered and died at all, and a mere man could not have suffered and died sufficiently, the suffering and death of the God-man was both real and sufficient, real because of the human nature, and sufficient because of the divine nature. *Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!*<sup>4)</sup> A lamb brought to the slaughter, wounded, bruised, chastised, oppressed, afflicted, and put to grief, when God made his soul an offering for sin;<sup>5)</sup> but a lamb of God, worthy to receive honor and glory and blessing.<sup>6)</sup> For the blood of Jesus Christ is God's own blood,<sup>7)</sup> and the death of him, of whom Pilate truly said, *Behold the man!*<sup>8)</sup> was the death of the Son of God.<sup>9)</sup> Thus did God, *sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemn sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.*<sup>10)</sup> Thus, by the God-man, was the eternal purpose of God, the redemption of the world, achieved. A. G.

(To be continued.)

1) Rom. 5, 19.

2) Phil. 2, 8.

3) 1 John 2, 2.

4) John 1, 29.

5) Is. 53, 5—7. 10.

6) Rev. 5, 12.

7) 1 John 1, 7. Acts 20, 28.

8) John 19, 5.

9) Rom. 5, 10. We were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.

10) Rom. 8, 3. 4.

## Historical Theology.

---

### LUTHER'S CONDUCT AT WORMS.

When the first Diet of Charles V was convened at Worms, the man of first importance in the German empire, and in the world, was not the youthful Emperor, who had, aside of purchasing votes, done little or nothing of great and lasting consequence, but Martin Luther, an Augustinian friar and Professor of Wittenberg; and the days of Worms were among the most important, not only in Luther's life, but in the history of the Christian church and of the world. Luther's appearance at Worms, his refusal of the recantation demanded of him, and his statement of cause for such refusal, decided the movement of the balance which held the thralldom of the nations in one and the freedom of millions in the other scale. It is but natural that so prominent a figure should not only have attracted the searching gaze of thousands in those eventful days, but also invited the scrutiny of those who in later days were or considered themselves called upon to record the facts and estimate the forces of that gigantic conflict of which the venerable town of Worms saw one of the decisive actions in those April days of 1521. And while such characters as Charles V and the papal legate, Jerome Aleander, have been by no means the gainers by what they put on record against their names,<sup>1)</sup> Luther appears to best advantage in the most penetrating searchlight of historical research, as he stands and moves in the foreground of the

---

1) That Charles V, in consequence of his licentiousness, in later years suffered from what was then known as the "French disease," syphilis, has long been on record. From Aleander's journal, lately discovered, it appears that a "fair lady" of the Campus Martius bore him a son during the Diet of Worms, having in two previous years born two children to two other lovers.

grand historic tableau of which he is the most significant figure.

Our present purpose is not a detailed portraiture of the great hero of the Reformation as he appears at Worms. Our endeavor shall, on this occasion, only be to place into the proper light two points which have attracted considerable attention and have been largely misconstrued and misrepresented.

The first question we propose to answer is this:—How are we to account for the fact that Luther, on the 17th of April, at his first appearance before the Emperor and the princes and States, instead of answering the question put to him, asked for time to consider before making his answer? For this apparent hesitancy and lack of resolute determination Luther was at once and in the presence of the assembly sternly reprimanded by the imperial *Orator*, Dr. Eck, the Official of the Bishop of Treves, and to this day Romanist historians endeavor to hold up to ridicule the man who, having for days and weeks known what was expected of him, and after all the professions of dauntless courage with which he had courted the prospects of a hearing before the diet, did not know what to say or had not the courage to say what he was as free to say then as later. "Though such a request was very silly, the mild and clement Charles V granted it," says a modern Roman catholic author of a "*Life of Luther compiled from reliable sources.*"<sup>1)</sup> Others, more kindly disposed, have apologized for what they, too, considered a weakness in the Reformer's conduct. "To us," says a protestant writer,<sup>2)</sup> "his mode of action appears most touching and worthy of our admiration, when we see that he too was human as we are, subject to the common weakness of our nature, which makes us embarrassed in view of unaccustomed splendor and trembling at threaten-

---

1) Rev. William Stang.

2) Friedr. Soldan, *der Reichstag zu Worms.* 1883. P. 75.



ing danger. . . . In that splendid assembly, knowing himself to be at variance with the supreme secular powers, and face to face with a world of enemies, he might well feel himself for a moment forsaken, forsaken even of his God.' But is Luther in need of such or similar apologies?

Two questions were sprung upon Luther when he was first taken before the assembly convened at Worms. The one was, whether the twenty books piled up before him were his. The other question was, whether he would retract and recant what those books contained. Is it reasonable to suppose that Luther had expected or even deemed it probable or possible that, when he went to Worms, he was being taken before the Diet for the purpose of simply having these questions put to him and answering them by *Yes* or *No*? From the words of Dr. Eck it would seem so. For when Luther had requested a respite, he said, "Although you, Martin Luther, might have sufficiently understood from the imperial mandate for what purpose you had been brought hither, and are therefore unworthy of being granted more time for consideration, yet," etc. But this was a falsehood. Here is the imperial mandate, the original of which is still extant.

*Karll von Gottes Gnadenn Erwelter Rhomischer  
Keysserr*

*Zu allenn tzeitenn Mherer des Reichs etc.*

*Ersamer lieber andechtigerr. Nachdem wir vnnnd des heyligen Reichs Stennde yetz hie versamlctt fuergenhommen vnd entschlossenn der Lerenn vnnnd Buecher halbenn: so eyn tzeitherr von dir aussgangenn seinn, erkundigung von dir zuentpfahenn haben wir dir herzekummen vnnnd von dannen widderumb an ein sicher gewarssam vnser vnd des Reichs Frey gestrackh sicherhait vnd gelaytt gegebenn, das wir dir hienebenn zusenden Mit Beger du wollest dich fürderlich erhebenn Also das du in den ainvndzwaintzigstenn tagen in solchem vnnssernn geleitt bestimbtt gewisslichenn hie bey*

*vns seyest vnd nit aussbeleibest, dich auch keyns Gewalts oder vnrechtens besorgen. Dann wir dich bey dem obgemelten vnnssernn Gelaitt vesstiklich handthabenn wellenn. Vnns auff solch dein Zukunfft entlich vorlassenn vnd du thust daran vnnsser ernstlich maynung. Geben in vnnser vnnd des Reichs Stadt Wormbs am Sechsten tag des Mone-des Marci Anno etc. 1500 vnd im ainundzwaintzigstenn vnnssers Reichs im andernn Jarenn.*

CAROLUS.

*Ad mandatum domini  
Imperatoris  
pp. m.  
Albertus Cardinalis  
Moguntinus  
archicancellarius sub-  
scripsit.*

Which is in English:—

Charles, by the grace of God Roman Emperor elect,  
Semper Augustus, etc.

Honorable, dear, devout (Doctor). We and the States of the holy Empire now here assembled, having purposed and resolved to receive information of you concerning the doctrines and books some time since issued by you, we have given you our and the realm's free and safe conduct to come hither and to return hence to a safe place, sending you such conduct with the request that you would start without delay, so that within twenty-one days you may in such our conduct be certainly here with us and not fail to come, neither fear any violence or injury. For we shall firmly protect you with our abovesaid conduct. We are confident of your coming, and you will thereby perform our earnest desire. Given in our and the imperial city of Worms this sixth day of the month of March, Anno 1500 and twenty-one, and the second year of our reign.

Charles.

By order of our lord, the Emperor,  
Albert, Archbishop of Mentz.  
Arch-chancellor.

Where, in this entire "Imperial Mandate," is there, implicitly or explicitly, a statement or indication whereby Luther might have been made to understand that he was called to Worms for the purpose of making a recantation of all he had ever written? Even if the Mandate had been simply a citation with assurance of personal safety, saying nothing whatever of the purpose of the measure, Luther would have been fully justified in expecting something far different from what now faced him at his first appearance before the Diet. The Emperor, on his way to Worms, had come to an agreement according to which the Elector was to bring Luther with him to the Diet, and in reply to a request of Frederick, that nothing should be done against Luther without a previous hearing in due form, Charles had, in a letter dated Nov. 28, 1520, stated his willingness to have Luther "sufficiently examined by men of learning and superior understanding," and that he would see to it that he should suffer no injury, and this had been at once communicated to Luther by Spalatin. Luther had responded that if he were called he would surely come. "Consider me ready for everything except that I should flee or recant. Flee I will not, and much less will I recant."<sup>1)</sup> But the conditions which the Emperor had attached to his offer were such that the Elector found them unacceptable; and the Emperor himself changed his mind to please the Pope, who, in a bull of January 3, 1521, definitely and conclusively condemned and excommunicated Martin Luther as an obdurate heretic who had refused the recantation demanded by the previous bull, *Exsurge, Domine*, of June 16, 1520. By the bull *Decet Romanum pontificem*, Luther's case in the tribunal of the Roman see was closed and judgment pronounced and sentence and penalty imposed, not only upon Luther himself, but upon all his adherents and abettors, who were by this bull officially stigmatized as *Luther-*

---

1) De Wette, *Luthers Briefe*, I, 534 f.

ans.<sup>1)</sup> By this measure, the final judgment of the supposed Head of Christendom, the plan of citing the condemned monk even for the purpose of public recantation was to be shut out. The bull itself stated that the time for recantation, which the preliminary bull had limited to sixty days, was over and past. It should, however, be noted that the recantation demanded by the bull *Exsurge, Domine*, was not a sweeping retraction of all that Luther had ever written, but a revocation of certain assertions termed "errors" and specified, forty-one in number, in the body of the bull and again referred to in the bull *Decet Romanum pontificem*.

Soon, however, the wind had again veered around and blew from a different direction with considerable velocity and turbulence. The Diet fairly bristled with grievances against the prevailing order or disorder of things, and among the dissatisfied princes there were those who, like Duke George of Saxony, were Luther's bitter enemies, but at the same time knew and acknowledged that they could find no better champion of the German cause than Doctor Martinus of Wittenberg. Even the Emperor would have been willing to play the Friar as the highest card against the pope if circumstances had appeared such that it might be safely done. For Pope and Emperor, though apparently

---

1) The passage here referred to is this: "*Ut igitur cum Martino et aliis haeretibus excommunicatis et anathematizatis et maledictis merito copulentur, et sicut in delinquendo dicti Martini pertinaciam sequuntur, ita poenarum et nominis participes fiant, secumque Lutherani vocem et debitas portent poenas;*" i. e., "That they may be deservedly coupled with Martinus and other excommunicated, anathematized and accursed heretics, and, as they follow the said Martinus in headstrong delinquency, so they may also share his punishment and name and bear with them the name of *Lutheran* and the due penalties." It thus appears that the name of Lutherans was not chosen by the followers of the Reformer as a badge of honor, in what has been censured as man-worship, but that it was inflicted upon them as an opprobrious term by their sworn enemy, the Pope, speaking *ex cathedra*. As a parallel we may here observe that the *Mis-sourians* were first statedly called by that name in the publications of one of their earliest and most persistent opponents, Grabau. And it is probable, that the term *Christians* had a similar genesis at Antioch.



partners, were by no means always on the same side of the game. The question, whether Luther should be summoned, was discussed in private and in public, *pro* and *contra*, by friends and enemies, with growing numbers in the affirmative, in spite of all that Aleander could do and did to the contrary, until a papal brief demanding that the Emperor should issue an edict against Luther in execution of the papal Bull brought matters to a crisis. By a speech of three long hours Aleander endeavored to prevail upon the States to proceed against the condemned heretic at once and without a further hearing. But the majority of the German princes looked with little favor upon the draft of an imperial edict submitted to them, in which the Emperor stated that, as Luther had been declared a manifest heretic and condemned by papal Holiness, "it was not necessary nor proper to give him any further hearing." They reminded the Emperor, "by way of warning,"<sup>1)</sup> that the publication of the edict as intended might bring on an insurrection in Germany. They held that Luther should be given safe conduct to come and go, that he should be heard by learned and expert men, not by way of disputation, but by enquiry whether he acknowledged and maintained the writings and articles issued against the Christian faith professed by them and their ancestors; and if he recanted the same, that he should be further heard and equitably dealt with on the other points and matters at issue. If, however, he should persist in maintaining all or several articles contrary to the Christian church and the faith which they and their ancestors had hitherto believed and maintained, they would stand by His Imperial Majesty in sustaining the faith of their fathers, and the imperial edict should then be promulgated throughout the realm. Here a distinction was made between such articles as were considered at variance with the doctrines of the church and the faith of the fathers, and the other

---

1) *warnungsweis*

points and matters, grievances and charges preferred against the see of Rome by princes and States. It was in compliance with these resolutions that the Emperor issued the citation quoted above and commissioned the imperial herald, Caspar Sturm, to conduct Luther in safety from Wittenberg to Worms. The Emperor fully understood, what the princes demanded. Luther was to have a hearing: that was the sum and substance of what was wanted. What was foremost in the minds of the many were not the articles of faith, but the grievances of the nation, and if it had not been for these, Luther would never have been summoned to appear before the Diet. Though schedules of alleged errors had been drawn from Luther's writings, one of them by Glapio, the Emperor's confessor, from Luther's book on the *Babylonian Captivity*, the same Glapio and others admitted that much of what Luther had written was good and worthy of all consideration. On the other hand, long lists of grievances against the curia were drawn up and circulated, and hopes were entertained, that Luther might be prevailed upon to retract his most offensive statements and thus render himself available for a championship for which no living man was better qualified than the author of that brilliant *Book to the Christian Nobles of the German Nation* and the tracts for the people, by which he had already begun a campaign which tended toward an emancipation of Germany from Roman tyranny. If evidence hereof had been desired, it was amply furnished by Luther's journey to Worms, which was a series of ovations from beginning to end. Why? Chiefly because of what Luther had so clearly and distinctly set forth in his books and pamphlets on the burning questions of the day. And to these books and pamphlets the imperial summons also referred. In this mandate, which was placed into Luther's hands on March 26, the one purpose of his appearance at Worms was stated in these terms: "Having purposed and resolved to receive information of you concerning the doctrines and books some

time since issued by you." *Erkundigung von dir zu empfangen*, were the words of the original. This certainly did not and could not mean that Luther was to be placed before the simple alternative of *yes* or *no* on the question, whether he would recant all he had written. *Erkundigung empfangen*, to receive information, concerning doctrines and books, if it said anything at all, said that the Emperor and States were desirous of learning certain things they did not know concerning Luther's doctrines and books. *Erkundigung* is the acquisition of a thorough knowledge or understanding of a thing. So Luther understood the word; as when he says, *Wie man ein ding keret, hinden vnd vorn besihet, das man will eigentlich erkunden*,<sup>1)</sup> i. e., "as we turn and view behind and before what we would accurately learn to know." To say, what Dr. Eck said, that from the imperial summons Luther might have known that he had been called for the purpose of simply recanting all his books, was so glaring and palpable a falsehood that the opposite and the contrary were true; the opposite, inasmuch as Luther could *not* read or even guess such a thing from the Emperor's words; and the contrary, as the words clearly stated something else and very different, declaring the willingness and desire of the Emperor and States to gain from Luther a better knowledge of points connected with or contained in his books, of which he, the author, was the authentional interpreter. The absence of any mention of recantation, and the explicit statement that *Erkundigung* was wanted of him, must have been all the more conspicuous to Luther as he had, but a week before, received from Spalatin a copy of the articles he would be called upon to recant. On receipt of those articles he had declared that if he should be summoned to Worms to make retraction, he would not go; for if he would retract at all, he might do so in Wittenberg as well. This being his mind, the very fact of his

---

1) Gloss to 1 Chron. 20, 3.

compliance with the summons is conclusive evidence that Luther did not expect to be inveigled into what must have seemed to him a veritable fool's errand, to see himself called upon to recant, not only a string of purported errors laid to his charge, but all his books in a bulk! That this was really what Luther thought and felt appears from a letter which he wrote to his friend Lucas Kranach, the painter, on April 28, when these scenes were still fresh in his mind. In the course of this letter he says, *Ich meinet, Kaiserliche Majestät sollt ein Doctor oder fünfzig haben versammelt, und den Mönch redlich überwunden; so ist nichts mehr hie gehandelt, denn so viel: Sind die Bücher dein? Ja. Willt du sie widerrufen? Nein. So heb dich. O wir blinde Deutsche, wie kindisch handeln wir, und lassen uns so jämmerlich die Romanisten äffen und narren.* "I thought, His imperial Majesty would have assembled some fifty Doctors and honestly overcome the monk. Now no more has been done than this: Are these books thine? Yes. Wilt thou retract them? No. Then be off! Oh the blind Germans that we are! How childish is our conduct to permit these Romanists thus miserably to ape and fool us!"<sup>1)</sup>

Indeed, under these circumstances, the question proposed to Luther on the 17th of April was a piece of shameless effrontery for which Luther was not and could not be prepared. The words of Dr. Eck, as we find them recorded in the Latin *Acta* were to this effect: *Martine Luthere, sacra et invicta Caesarea Maiestas huc vocari te iussit, ut his duabus de causis te interrogarem, Primum, fatearisne libros hos praesentes, qui tuo nomine praetitulati circumferuntur, tuos esse, illosque pro tuis agnoscas necne? Deinde, an illos et eorundem contenta retractare et revocare, vel inhaerere eisdem potius et inseverare velis,*<sup>2)</sup> i. e., "Martin Luther, His sacred and invincible Majesty the Emperor has

---

1) Opp. Erl. Germ. 53, p. 65.

2) Opp. Luth. Lat. Jen. II, 412 b.



ordered you to be called hither that I might question you on these two points: first, whether you confess these books here present, which are being circulated with your name on the titles, to be yours, and acknowledge them as your books or not; and further, whether you are willing to retract and revoke them, or rather to stand and abide by them."

Had the situation been less grave, Luther might have answered these questions, unexpected as they were and must have been, without a moment's thought or hesitation. For as to the first question, Luther could not have denied his authorship of the books before him; there was no man under the sun or moon who could have written them but he; they bore the stamp and imprint of his mind, even though his name had not been given on the title pages. And as to the second question, his mind had been long ago made up and his resolution fixed, and his answer had already been given over his signature that, come what might, he could not recant. But here was a predicament for which he was not and could not have been prepared, and that upon an occasion which might never return, when every word he spoke might be of incalculable consequence. What should he do? Should he tell the Emperor and his spokesman and the like of them that they were a faithless, treacherous set, having lured him from Wittenberg to Worms under the pretext of obtaining information from him concerning his doctrines and writings, merely to ask him whether he would do what they well knew he would not do? Should he give vent to his righteous indignation at this shameless duplicity of men who, when they saw all their wiles frustrated with which to the last hour they had endeavored to prevent his coming, had hit upon a way of turning the solemn occasion into a colossal farce? If he had, he might have changed the intended comedy into a tremendous tragedy, precipitating a conflict right there at Worms which might have cost the Emperor and Dr. Eck and hundreds of others their lives. Many a sword and poniard had been loosened in the scab-

bard, and many who had hurled curses and imprecations at Aleander's head wherever he had shown himself outside of his lair near the Emperor's quarters were anxious to go from words to blows at any provocation by the Romanists under whose insolence they chafed and ground their teeth. Or should Luther simply say, No, he would not recant, and thereby exhibit himself as an obstinate, headstrong, stiff-necked heretic in the eyes of the majority who had not read his books and judged only from the papal bulls and what such men as Eck and Aleander had added by way of comment before and during the Diet? This was precisely what the Romanists desired and, probably, expected, and, with this result in their favor, they would have made easy game of the German princes who had pledged their support to the papal bull and the imperial edict against Luther if he should prove recalcitrant and refuse to recant the errors scored against him. In either case the day would have been lost to Luther and the cause for which he had appeared. And a smaller man than he would have boldly, perhaps ostentatiously, walked into the pitfall prepared for him. But Luther saw what Sickingen would have failed to see, and did what Hutten would have disdained to do: he openly and candidly confessed that he was not ready for the question as proposed, and asked for time to consider. And Luther did more. He said, *Quia de fide est quaestio et animarum salute, et quia divinum verbum concernit, quo nihil maius est tam in coelo quam in terra, quod nos merito revereri convenit omnes, temerarium et iuxta periculosum fuerit me quidquam incogitatum proferre, cum et minus quam pro re et maius quam pro vero non praemeditatum asserere possim, quorum utrumque me in sententiam adducet, quam Christus tulit cum ait, Qui me negaverit coram hominibus, negabo eum coram Patre meo, qui in coelis est. Peto igitur hac de causa, et quidem suppliciter, a Caesarea Maiestate spatium deliberandi, ut citra divini verbi iniuriam et animae meae periculum interrogationi satisfaciam; i. e., "Whereas this is a question of*

faith and the salvation of souls, and whereas it concerns the divine word, than which there is nothing greater in heaven and in earth, and to revere which behooves us all, it would be rash and highly dangerous for me to utter anything not duly considered, since I might without previous deliberation assert less than the occasion demands and more than truth permits, and in both cases I should fall under the sentence pronounced by Christ, saying, Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven. For this reason I beg and beseech His Majesty the Emperor to grant me time to consider, in order that I may do justice to the question without injury to the divine word and danger to my soul." The entire work of the reformation had from the very beginning been to Luther a matter, not of expediency, but of conscience, performed in close and strict adherence to the word of God. In this spirit he had spoken and written and done what he had spoken, written and done from the publication of his ninety-five theses against the abuse of indulgences to the burning of the papal bull and decretals, and even in his coming to Worms he had been prompted by his conscience, being fully persuaded that when the Emperor called him, he was called by the Lord. This, then, was the real predicament in which Luther saw himself unexpectedly placed: how far could he conscientiously go without, in form or substance, committing himself to a violation of his Master's word and without endangering or injuring a cause which was not his own but God's?

So, far from being an object of censure or apology, the Reformer, at his first appearance before the Diet, rather claims our unqualified admiration as a man who, even in a position into which he had been thrown or lured entirely unprepared, he was not for a moment inconsistent, but then as ever the honest, conscientious, God-fearing Luther, who, free from bravado and from fear of men, baffled the evil designs of the scheming, treacherous Romanists and set an

example to friend and foe and for all times by putting aside every other consideration when his own and other people's conscience was at peril and the word and truth of God was at stake. Great indeed was Luther on the 18th of April, when he made his explicit, ponderous answer, every part and paragraph of which was what careful preparation and a master mind and a heroic faith by the guiding hand of God could make it. But that Thursday could never have been without the Wednesday preceding it, and to do justice to the situation of the 17th required fully as great a man as the task he so brilliantly accomplished on the 18th, and called into action qualities of heart and mind and traits of true greatness which the following day did not bring out into like prominence. Thus the two days of Worms must go together as among the most important in all history.

A second point in Luther's conduct at Worms which has been misconstrued is this. When Luther, at his second appearance before the Emperor and States had closed his great speech, the Emperor's spokesman, charging him with having shirked the cardinal question, demanded *simplex et non cornutum responsum, an velit revocare vel non*, "a simple answer without any horns, whether he would recant or not." Thereupon Luther replied, *Quando ergo serenissima Maiestas vestra Dominationesque vestrae simplex responsum petunt, dabo illud neque cornutum, neque dentatum, in hunc modum: Nisi convictus fuero testimoniis Scripturarum, aut ratione evidente (nam neque Papae, neque Conciliis solis credo, cum constet eos errasse saepius et sibi ipsis contradixisse), victus sum Scripturis a me adductis captaque est conscientia in verbis Dei; revocare neque possum neque volo quidquam, cum contra conscientiam agere neque tutum sit, neque integrum;*<sup>1)</sup> i. e., "Whereas your most Serene Majesty and your Lordships demand a simple answer, I shall give it without horns and teeth, in this wise:

---

1) Opp. Lat. Jen. II, 414 a.



Unless I be convicted by testimonies of the Scriptures, or by evident reason (for I believe neither the Pope nor the Councils alone, because it is certain that they have often erred and contradicted themselves), I am vanquished by the Scriptures adduced by me, and my conscience is bound by the words of God; I neither can nor will recant anything, as it is neither secure nor right to do anything against one's conscience." In this summary answer, it has been said, Luther declares his willingness to have his doctrines tested by two things, the word of God and human reason, *testimoniis Scripturarum aut ratione evidente*, and thus it appears that Luther did not hold the Scriptures to be the sole *principium cognoscendi et judicandi* in spiritual things and matters of conscience, but granted human reason its place beside the word of God. This assertion might seem to gain strength from the fact that in the course of the negotiations subsequently carried on with Luther before his departure from Worms, one of the committeemen appointed by the Diet to confer with him, Joachim, Elector of Brandenburg, asked him, *Num dixisset se non esse cessurum, nisi convictum Sacra Scriptura*, "whether he had said he would not yield unless he were convicted by the holy Scriptures;" and Luther replied, *Etiam Domine clementissime, vel rationibus clarissimis et evidentibus*; <sup>1)</sup> "Just so, kind Lord, or by most clear and evident arguments of reason."

To understand this distinction it is necessary to remember that Luther had written on a great variety of subjects, some of them not strictly theological. Especially in one of his latest books, *to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*, which was perhaps better known than any of the rest, he entered upon a number of grievances and recommendations pertaining rather to the sphere of civil legislation and the administration of public affairs, as the total abolishment of mendicancy, a thorough reform of the uni-

---

1) Ibid. fol. 415b.

versities, sumptuary laws and the restriction of foreign commerce, matters which he had expressly distinguished from the "spiritual ailments" previously considered. He had recommended that all the holidays except Sunday be abolished or, if the great Saints' days should be celebrated, that it be done on the previous or following Sundays, or only with a morning service, the rest of the day being given to regular labor. He had laid down a plan for negotiating with the Bohemians and the Beghards and bringing about a restoration of these people to the fold of the catholic church. What Luther had proposed concerning these matters was what he considered conducive or even necessary to the best interests of the people, and he could not honestly recant what he still held to be good and wise counsel. But as he had not claimed in behalf of these proposals the authority of the word of God, so he was ready to reconsider them in the light of sound and sober argument and to yield to better judgment where his own judgment might be shown to have gone below or above the mark.

Here then, we have one class of utterances contained in Luther's writings concerning which he might declare his readiness to yield to arguments of reason without conceding to human reason what he would reserve to the word of Scripture only as the one and only infallible and authoritative source and norm of Christian doctrine and rule of life. Besides, there were in Luther's publications historical statements, references to papal bulls and decretals, exegetical arguments, the correctness, pertinence, or stringency of which might have been questioned for historical or grammatical or logical reasons and by arguments based thereon. By declaring his willingness to hear and consider such arguments Luther did nothing which a theologian might not do to-day without for a moment or in any sense abandoning his position that theological truths or Christian doctrines must be determined by the plain word of Scripture only. Even among the propositions condemned in the papal Bulls

there were several of which Luther himself had said that he had not based them on scriptural ground, but given them as his opinion. "These three articles," we hear him say, "I have only advanced for discussion, in the manner of the schools, and often acknowledged that such is my opinion, but that I know of no ground or certainty which I might point out in the matter. . . . If you would argue thereon, let it remain a mere notion or private opinion, as I do."<sup>1</sup>) He had resented the arrogance of the Romanists who had condemned him "without Scripture and reason" and refused to answer "his Scripture and reason."<sup>2</sup>) But while he is not willing to recant even an opinion which is still his opinion, he is only consistent and knows precisely what he is about when he declares his willingness to hear either Scripture or reason and in the light of either reconsider his *opinion*. This leaves the principle intact that in matters, not of opinion, but of faith and doctrine, the word of Scripture only can and must decide between truth and error. Thus also in this point, Luther's conduct at Worms was without reproach, an example to every theologian and all Christians to the end of time.

A. G.

---

1) Grund und Ursach aller Artikel etc. Opp. Erl. Germ. 24, pp. 149 f.

2) *Dass aber die Papisten und Bullisten mich darin verdammen und kein ander Ursach setzen, denn ihr eigen muthwilliges Dünkel, ohn Schrift und Vernunft aufgeblasen, dazu auf meine Schrift und Vernunft nit antworten, lass ich mich nicht anfechten.* Ibid. p. 149.

## Exegetical Theology.

---

### A PEN-PICTURE OF CHRIST DRAWN FROM THE PROPHET ISAIAH.

---

#### III. CHRIST, THE SUFFERING MESSIAH.<sup>1)</sup>

The reception which Christ found in Galilee and in Judea was quite in accordance with another prophecy of Isaiah. For chap. 8, 14. 15 we read of the Son of the Virgin: *And He shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken.* We note that he mentions both houses of Israel, but that he points especially to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. These had the temple of the Lord in their midst and had more opportunities to hear and learn the word of God, both the law and the divine promises of Christ the Savior, than the rest of the houses of Israel. Daily they saw before their eyes the sacrifices of rams and lambs which were to be types and figures of Christ. A very great number of those that were appointed to be builders of Zion (Ps. 118, 22) lived amongst them, namely the highpriest, a great many of the priests, elders and scribes of the Jewish nation. But their opposition and burning hatred against Christ and His doctrine grew stronger every time Christ made a visit to the temple and the city, and this hatred resulted at Christ's last journey up to Jerusalem in His arraignment before the ecclesiastical and civil courts in that city, and in His crucifixion demanded by a clamorous and seditious mob which was in-

---

1) The II Chapter, on *Christ's public ministry*, will be published in another issue. The present instalment seemed more in time as the lenten season is drawing near.



stigated and incited to this heinous crime by their own spiritual leaders. Thus we have arrived at Christ's *Passio Magna*, the Great Passion, by which the Holy One in Israel suffered not only the most shameful death from the hands of sinners, but by which He also accomplished and brought to a glorious end the work of the salvation of a lost world. The first prophecy which treats of this subject expressedly is Is. 43, 22—25.

In the foregoing verses we find a description of the glorious condition and the spiritual blessings of the Church of the New Testament. Of the Israel of that time, the Israel after the Spirit, God says, v. 21: *This people have I formed for myself; they shall shew forth my praise.* Then the Lord proceeds, vv. 22—24: *But thou hast not called upon me, O Jacob; but thou hast been weary of me, O Israel. Thou hast not brought me the small cattle of thy burnt offerings; neither hast thou honored me with thy sacrifices. I have not caused thee to serve with an offering, nor wearied thee with incense. Thou hast bought me no sweet cane with money, neither hast thou filled me with the fat of thy sacrifices.* The emphasis in these statements lies evidently upon the pronoun *Me*. Otherwise all these words would have no meaning whatever or even be contrary to the truth. For in the very time of Isaiah the people of the Jews did much in praying, fasting and in observing the external rites of the ceremonial law, although their offerings were prompted by mere hypocrisy, Is. 1, 11—15. More than this, in the times after the Babylonian captivity the Jews were more zealous than ever before to offer the prescribed sacrifices and oblations, more eager than at any time previous to come up to the requirements of the cult instituted by Moses. But God says, v. 22: *But thou hast not called upon me, O Jacob; BUT, or rather, BECAUSE thou hast been weary of me.* They did all this with a spirit of weariness, as a servant obeys his master not willingly, not voluntarily, but in order to pay off a heavy debt for which the master could

have him imprisoned, or in order to earn his wages. Thus the Jews were given to the illusion that by keeping the law externally they could balance their account, get even with God. God would be obliged to forgive them their sins and to bestow upon them all temporal and heavenly blessings as a just reward for their work and labor. But God declares unto them, and in fact to all the self-righteous, that this is not the case. They have not served Him, they have not given anything to Him that is the Lord of heaven and earth. If there was any benefit from these rites and ceremonies, they were to have it, since these were instituted to remind them of their God and Savior who continues now: *But thou hast made Me to serve with thy sins, thou hast wearied Me with thine iniquities.* The Lord has not caused the Jews to serve, He has not made men to weary. On the contrary, the sins and iniquities of Jews and Gentiles have laid upon Him, brought upon Him the weary and tedious labor of a, or rather, *the* servant of men. God's favor, the grace of the holy and righteous God, the forgiveness of sin and life eternal cannot be bought and earned by men, not even by the most pious and holy. For, says the prophet himself, chap. 64, 6, *we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away.* There is no exception. God threatens His eternal wrath and punishment even to the one that keeps the whole law and transgresses it but in one point, and to free men from all the curse and threat of the law costs certainly a higher price than the blood of rams, more than the offering of sweet cane and precious incense.

The task and burden to purchase a sinful world from sin, death, devil, and hell, the task even to save one sinner from the well deserved damnation is too much for angels and archangels; how could corrupt and sinful men do it? If we shall be saved, our guilt removed, our debt payed, Paradise lost restored to fallen men, God Himself must do it. God

and God alone can work out our salvation. And Christ, the Son of God, has undertaken, has carried out this work. As the servant of God, but also as the servant of men, as the *Servus Servorum* he has toiled, worked, labored with body and soul for our salvation. His whole life on earth from His birth until His death was work, toil, poverty, trouble, misery, humiliation for the sake of men. He was born and reared in poverty and humility. When eight days old He suffered the pains of circumcision, being made not only under the moral but also under the ceremonial law. Soon after His parents had to flee with Him to Egypt. During the time of His public ministry He was indefatigable in traveling, teaching, performing miracles publicly and privately, He was tempted by Satan, contradicted and persecuted by the rulers of His own people; one time He fasted forty days and forty nights; many nights were spent by Him in prayer and intercession, even when He had grown into manhood He had not where to lay His head. By the sight of human misery and human sin His tender and guiltless soul was easier and more deeply affected than any other man, and many more things could be mentioned in confirmation of the fact that His toil and labor did not first begin with His Great Passion. But all the work, all the sorrow, all the misery which the sins of the whole world have caused, pressed upon the divine Redeemer when the last day of His earthly life had come. Witnesses thereof are Gethsemane, the palaces of the highpriests and of Herod, the judgment hall of the Roman procurator Pontius Pilate, the Via Dolorosa, and Calvary. Yea, on Calvary His agony, His anguish, His struggle were so undescribably great that even Nature put on mourning, the face of the heavens waxed black, the noonday sun turned unto darkness, the earth quaked, rocks rent, and He, the eternal and beloved Son of the heavenly Father, cries out: *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* But He also exclaims on the cross: *It is finished.* It is, therefore, not man, but God Himself, the incarnate Son

of God, who extinguishes, or rather, has extinguished the wrath of God against the sinners and has acquired for us the forgiveness of sin. In the following words the Lord assures us of this truth in the most emphatic manner. *I, even I, we read further on, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.* God, the Son of God, does not only assure us here that He is willing, that He is ready, to blot out our sins and to remember no more our transgressions. These words imply, yea, declare more. Through His work and toil He has really and effectually blotted out our transgressions, done away with our sins, caused them to be remembered no more. He has offered a perfect sacrifice for our sins, nothing of the law is left to be fulfilled, nothing of our debt remains to be paid for by us in order to obtain the forgiveness of sin and life eternal, and if many men are still condemned it is in reality not because they are sinners, but because they reject by their unbelief the salvation wrought by the Son of God. God blots out our transgressions and will not remember our sins for His own sake. The Father has sent His Son to bear and take away the sins of the world; the Son has finished the work allotted to Him, not because man has or will ever deserve it, either in part or altogether, but simply for His own name's sake, because His name is: *The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth*, Ex. 34, 6. But although what the Lord declares in this passage is true in the first place of the so-called universal or objective justification, it is not less true of the subjective or individual justification of the sinner through faith in Christ Jesus. If this were not the case, the Lord could not say even when speaking of the universal justification: *I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.* If there had been something in the conduct of some men which might cause the Lord to give them justifying faith, or to convert them, the same must have



been also one of the causes which prompted Him to work out the salvation of mankind. But the salvation of the sinner is from beginning to end the work of the Lord, and the Lord alone.

Another prophecy which sheds much light on Christ's Passion we find in Is. 50, 5—9. It begins with the words: *The Lord hath opened mine ear.* These words point not only forward, but also back to the foregoing context which treats of Christ's prophetic office. There the Messiah says: *The Lord hath given me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary.* Then He continues: *He wakeneth morning by morning, He wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned. The Lord hath opened mine ear.* His ear is awakened, is opened, according to this passage, in the first place to learn what to speak and when to speak to him that is weary, to them that labor and are heavy laden; but, on the other hand, His ear is also opened, as the following context proves, to comply with the will of the Lord, difficult though it be to do it. Here the Messiah does not appear as the servant of men, as in Is. 43, but as the servant of the Lord, the servant of His heavenly Father, like in Is. 53. And as the servant of the Lord He says: *and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back*, v. 5b. A servant becomes rebellious when too much work is demanded of him; a wanderer turns back from the path which he has chosen when he becomes aware that it is too dangerous to pursue it. But Christ did not shrink back from His suffering and passion, though He clearly foresaw and knew well what He had to go through, and although His apostles or at least St. Peter entreated Him not to expose Himself to the bitter hatred of His enemies and to the dangers He had predicted them. Even in Gethsemane, when all the misery and woe of human sin pressed upon Him, when He was assailed by all the powers of darkness and the counsel of our salvation had been dimmed for awhile in His human mind, at an hour where

He struggled with death and where His sweat was as it were great drops of blood, He did not murmur, He did not revolt against the will of His Father. He prays in the anguish of His soul, in His unspeakable agony: *Father, remove this cup from me.* Christ calls Him that had laid this burden upon Him, still His Father, yea, before He has uttered His request, He says: *If thou be willing,* and after having uttered it He adds immediately: *Nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done,* thus giving full assurance of His perfect willingness to resign His will to the will of His heavenly Father. From His prayer He rises to surrender Himself voluntarily, without any compulsion, to His wicked enemies. And in all the trials of this day of darkness He is and remains the willing, obedient Servant of the Lord, the one that says, Ps. 40, 7: *Lo, I come, in the volume of the book it is written of me.* Thus He atones for our waywardness, our revolt and disobedience against God.

The following verse now is an illustration of Christ's willingness to suffer, while at the same time it plainly sets forth His admirable patience in enduring the insults of His enemies. He proceeds, v. 6: *I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting.* Christ yielded Himself up, resigned Himself in obedience to the will of His heavenly Father, to the gross and most outrageous abuse of brutish and vile men, although He was the stronger, although He could have destroyed them with one word's speaking. Yea, even His enemies could have known this. For when He had said to the multitude which had come into the Garden of Gethsemane to bind Him, *I am He,* they went backward and fell to the ground. These unholy and weak men He suffered to scourge Him, to smite Him, to spit in His face, to mock Him and to pluck off His hair. The last of these provoking insults and cruelties is not particularly mentioned in the New Testament; but it is undoubtedly implied in the Greek word *κολάσειν*, which the English version of Holy Bible

renders by: *They buffeted Him*. Mark 14, 65. No other kind of contempt, no other ignominy, no other disgrace is more degrading and insulting to an honest man than to be spitted in the face, to be smitten on the cheeks, or to be ridiculed in a defenseless condition. The perfectly holy and innocent Son of man who was not hardened by sin as even an ordinary, honest man, must have suffered incomparably more under such treatment. He suffered all this and much more patiently without resenting these wrongs, and when He said to the officer of the highpriest who had smitten Him with the palm of his hand: *If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me?* these words were not intended to pay back the insult, but to rebuke the sin and convince the malefactor of his wrong. The next verse reads, v. 7: *For the Lord God will help me; therefore shall I not be confounded: therefore have I set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed.* At the beginning of this verse we have *copulativum*, which is evidently to be taken adversatively, and we therefore prefer *but* to *for*. The Messiah gave His back to the smiters, and hid not His face from shame and spitting, but in all His sufferings He trusts in God, in His help. In all His troubles and anguish He prays: *But Thou art holy, O Thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel. Be not far from me.* Ps. 22, 3. 11. When in His deepest humiliation He suffered all the tortures of damnation and hell, the cry burst from His dying lips: *My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?* but this very: *My God, my God*, etc., proves that His confidence in His God is still unshaken, that He still clings to Him, as His only stay and help, expecting Him to help where there is no help. He knows that He shall not be ashamed. Though His enemies did all they could to put Him to shame, yet He was not ashamed of His work, knowing that His trust in the Lord will not be in vain nor disappoint Him. For this reason He says in the same verse: *Therefore shall I not be con-*

*founded: therefore have I set my face like a flint.* He goes on in His work as our Mediator with unshaken constancy and undaunted resolution, without failing and without being discouraged. His trust in God upholds Him that He is determined to fulfill all that was written by the prophets concerning the Son of man, Luke 18, 31.

The Messiah continues in the same strain, v. 8: *He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me? Let us stand together: who is mine adversary? Let him come near to me.* God is near to Him with His help; ere long He shall be delivered. But He shall not only be delivered, but God does also justify Him. Christ was falsely accused, charged with blasphemy, with seditious conduct and preaching, He was sentenced to death by the priests and rulers of His people, yielded up by Pilate to the most shameful death on the cross, but at the same time the false witnesses put up against Him, Pilate himself, Herod, Pilate's wife, Judas, the thief on the cross, the centurion who had superintended His crucifixion, and even the impotent rage of His judges in the council must bear witness as to His innocence. Yea, God Himself testifies by many signs and wonders that the One dying now on the cross as the greatest malefactor is no ordinary man, much less an evildoer, but His Son, even God Himself. But the clearest evidence of Christ's innocence, the most indisputable proof of His divine Sonship is His exaltation, His resurrection, His ascension, the effusion of the Spirit (Acts 11, 36), the existence of the Church and His coming to judge the quick and the dead. Confident of God's help and His justification the suffering Messiah challenges His enemies, whoever they may be, in bold defiance: *Who will contend with me? Let us stand together: who is mine adversary? Let him come near to me.* Though He seems to succumb, though His enemies exult, they exult too soon; His is the triumph, His the final victory. To the chief priests, to the elders and to all the council He says while He stood before them as a culprit, Matt. 26, 64: *Never-*



*theless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.* But He defies not only His earthly enemies; He defies Satan and hell. The very first prophecy of Him foretells, that He shall bruise the Serpent's head and therefore conquer hell and all the hellish host. This triumphal song the suffering Servant of the Lord concludes with the words, v. 9: *Behold, the Lord God will help me; who is he that shall condemn me? lo, they all shall wax old as a garment; the moth shall eat them up.* Men shall take notice of and well consider this, that the Lord's help is with Him, that it is a vain undertaking to strive and side against Him, for it is too apparent that His enemies will perish. By murdering Christ the high priests and elders meant to preserve their own dignity and power, to protect the temple and the cult instituted by Moses; but soon after the temple was destroyed, the Mosaic cult discarded, never to be restored, while the Jewish nation is scattered all over the world, an accursed people until the end of the world, and in the meantime the new people of God is mainly gathered from the Gentiles. Let us, therefore, kiss the Son, lest we perish from the way, and then we can also defy all the enemies of our soul, saying with St. Paul, Rom. 8, 33. 34: *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God.*

We turn now to the most lucid, the most comprehensive and the most powerful prophecy of Christ's suffering and death together with His exaltation, Is. chap. 52, 13—53 to the end. This prophecy is the History proper of Christ's Passion in the Old Testament, and every Christian ought to be thoroughly acquainted with this admirable description of the Passion of our divine savior. This prophecy helps much to understand the account of Christ's suffering which the Evangelists have given. It has been rightly called the

Golden Passionale, and one of the interpreters of Isaiah has well said: If we had only Is. chap. 53 and Luke chap. 15 we would know enough to be saved. Even the ancient rabbis have understood this prophecy of the Messiah, but some Christians have been so blind and perverted as to refer it to the prophet Jeremiah, and the Chiliasts, still more perverted, have construed it into a song which the converted Jews would sing at Christ's coming for the establishment of the millennial kingdom. But the apostle Philip, who from hence preached to the eunuch, has put it past dispute that of Him speaks the prophet this, of Christ and of nobody and nothing else. The frequent use of the so-called *perfectum propheticum* in this passage is worthy of special notice. It gives to the whole prophecy much of impressiveness, inasmuch as these *perfecta prophetica* cause the reader not to look forward as to things still future, at least considered from the standpoint of the writer, but to look backward as to things which have become reality. Before the prophet, however, enters upon the full and particular description of Christ's suffering and exaltation, he makes first, vv. 13—15, an announcement of the great theme which has engaged his mind and pen.

We read, chap. 52, 13: *Behold, my servant shall deal prudently, He shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high.* "Behold," הִנֵּה, points again, like in Is. chap. 7, 14, to something wonderful and of the greatest importance, and, indeed, besides Christ's Nativity there can be nothing more important for sinful man than that which is recorded in Is. chap. 53. *Behold*, the Lord says, *my servant shall deal prudently.* Perfect prudence and wisdom, indeed, did the Servant of the Lord evince by humbling Himself, by His singular obedience in accomplishing the work of redemption which His heavenly Father had entrusted to Him. But He shall not be for ever a servant. His obedience, His humiliation, leads Him to great honors. In the same verse we read further on: *He shall be exalted and extolled, and be*

*very high.* These three synonymous terms not only impress upon our minds that His exaltation shall be certain and very great, but they point unmistakably to three distinct stages of Christ's exaltation, to His resurrection, His ascension, and His session at the right hand of the Father. For the first word used in the original, *רום*, denotes to rise from the ground, the second, *נשא*, to be lifted up, and the third, *נבה*, to be high, to occupy a high place or position.

Vv. 14. 15: *As many were astonished at Thee; His visage was so marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men: So shall He sprinkle many nations; the Kings shall shut their mouths at Him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider.* These two verses are closely connected grammatically as well as logically. They contain a comparison which is indicated by *כַּאֲשֶׁר*, as, at the beginning of v. 14, and by *כֵּן*, so, at the beginning of the 15th verse. They compare Christ in His state of humiliation and Christ in His state of exaltation. At Christ in His exinanition many are astonished or horrified. But why Christ has become a wonder or horror to many is told in the subsequent words: *His visage was so marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of man* or, according to the original: So (much) disfigurement away from man is His visage and His form from the sons of man. His visage and form is so miserable that He does not look any more like a man. He Himself complains, Ps. 22, 6: *But I am a worm and no man.* The nation abhorred Him, chap. 49, 7, treated Him as the off-scouring of all things. But as He was marred, or, rather, as He was abhorred, so shall He sprinkle many nations. The Hifil of *נָזַף* = to sprinkle is used in the Old Testament of the cleansing and purifying of the priests for which they took the blood of animals slain in the Sanctuary. And Christ shall cleanse, purify many nations from their sins by imparting to them that righteousness, that expiation which He has brought about by His

great humiliation, His suffering and death indicated in the 14th verse. This sprinkling of nations, however, the justification of a great many nations, is ascribed to the exalted Servant of the Lord. Then, when He is exalted and justifies many heathen, Kings, the representatives of them, shall shut their mouths at Him. Their horror shall be changed to admiration and silent, reverent astonishment. Thus the prophet says, chap. 49, 7: *Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship*. He that had been a horror to many shall receive from many divine honor and worship. But by what means these Kings and nations shall be justified or cleansed from their sins and thus converted, the following words tell us: *For that which had not been TOLD them shall they see, and that which they had not HEARD, shall they consider*. It is the word, the gospel or the preaching of the cross which brings to light things unheard of, the mystery kept secret from the beginning, and which, at the same time, effects such a change that kings and nations, instead of turning away from Christ in horror and disgust, adore Him as their gracious Lord and King. That the preaching of the gospel is meant here, can also be conclusively proven from Rom. 15, 21, where these words are quoted according to the translation of the Septuagint.

Now the sermon proper of the prophet begins, and begins with the complaint, chap. 53, 1: *Who hath believed our report? And to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?* Isaiah speaks in the name of all the preachers of the gospel, of all those who proclaim to the Jews as well as to the Gentiles the mysteries of Christ's Passion and His subsequent exaltation. The answer upon His questions is: Not many, only a few. To represent this answer as a general truth confirmed by the experience of all the preachers of the Gospel the prophet has employed in his exclamations the perfect tense. But how does this agree with the assertion made before that the exalted Christ shall sprinkle many nations, that many shall come to the true



faith in Christ? Both are true. The number of those converted through all the ages and inheriting eternal life through faith in Christ Jesus shall be very great; but still by far the greater majority of men have always and will as long as the world stands reject the preaching of the word, resist wilfully and persistently the saving power of the gospel, or, as the prophet puts it, the arm of the Lord is not revealed to them. They take offense at Christ, at His appearance in the world and his exceedingly great humiliation. For this reason the prophet proceeds, v. 2: *For He shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see Him, there is no beauty that we should desire Him.* These words together with verse 3 contain a brief summary of Christ's life on earth. Verse 2a applies evidently to Christ's youth, as we have seen in the first part of our pen-picture; verse 2b refers particularly to the time of Christ's life when His people *saw* Him, that is during the time of His public ministry, and the words: *He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see Him, there is no beauty*, do certainly not refer to Christ's person, to the form of His body, but to the manner of His appearing in the world, which had nothing in it of earthly glory. It would be unworthy of Christ and undoubtedly in contradiction to Ps. 45, 2 to assume that the holy and sinless body of Christ was in His youth and before His great suffering destitute of beauty and comeliness, or that He was in the least deformed and misshapen. His enemies would also have gladly availed themselves of such a reproach. They did, however, not desire Him, because His doctrine, His lowliness, His submission to all kinds of human infirmities and miseries, and above all a spiritual kingdom of God, did not suit their taste nor agree with the ideas they had conceived of their Messiah. And even to this day, when Christ is presented to carnal minded men's view in the preaching of the word they find nothing in Him that they would de-

sire, and the gospel itself is not preached with the enticing words of man's wisdom, but with all plainness appropriate to the subject. But the prejudices of carnal-minded men grow stronger yet when they see or hear of Christ's Passion proper and His death on the cross. And this subject is taken up again by the prophet in the following verse, v. 3: *He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from Him; He was despised, and we esteemed Him not.* Twice the prophet tells us in this sentence that Christ is despised, and He is not only despised because His person is not according to the expectations of men, but because His suffering and misery is beyond description. He is rejected or *חָרַל-אִשִּׁים*, ceasing in regard to men. His measureless suffering makes Him cease to be a man; so inhuman is the treatment which He has to undergo. The *Ecce Homo*, *Behold the man*, with which Pilate presents Christ to the merciless Jews, is to a measure expressive of the greatness of His misery; but even at that time the worst was yet to come. He is a man of sorrows or pains, a man acquainted with grief or sickness. His suffering is one continued chain of pains, tortures, sickness and consuming grief in body and soul, so that whosoever sees Him thinks of Him only as of the man of pains and sickness. They have given Him His character. The prophet says furthermore concerning this man of sorrows: *And we hid as it were our faces from Him*, or, according to the original: And as hiding of faces from Him. Christ's suffering is so unusually severe, His form and figure have become so utterly miserable that He is not only the object of deepest contempt but of horror and inexpressible disgust. And we esteemed Him not. His own people rejected Him, their King and their Messiah, and even His friends and disciples took offense at His suffering and left Him, increasing thus in no small degree the sorrow and grief of their loving Lord and Master.—In this verse we

had again, as in chap. 52, 14, Christ's suffering summed up and described with a few words, simple but full of meaning, and it is hardly necessary to point to peculiar incidents in His Passion in order to prove the fulfillment of them. The whole account of Christ's suffering as given by the four evangelists is one perpetual illustration of what these words express.

In the following verses, and in fact throughout the whole chapter, we have a further account of Christ's suffering. The prophet even enters on some details, but at the same time He gives us some necessary and wholesome information about the deep significance, the cause, the end and glorious fruit of this great Passion. First of all He tells us, vv. 4—6, why this excellent person, the Servant of the Lord, had to go through all this.

V. 4: *Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.* The second part of the verse shows what men thought to be the cause of this great suffering. They looked upon Christ as suffering justly for His crimes, and though they could lay nothing to His charge, they esteemed Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. Their verdict was that this man was marked by God Himself as the greatest of malefactors, paying now the just penalties of a wicked life and furnishing forever a conspicuous example of God's retributive justice. But God's verdict on the suffering of His Servant is quite different, entirely opposed to man's judgment. And the prophet introduces this judgment (verdict) with *surely*, יִשְׁׁרָ, as to leave no room for doubt or contradiction. He has borne our griefs or sicknesses and has carried our sorrows or our pains. Stress is evidently to be laid both times on the pronoun *our*. Christ's suffering is vicarious. Christ has not deserved this unutterable woe and misery Himself; He is and has remained holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners. What He suffers, He suffers because He has taken away from us our

sicknesses and our pains and taken them upon Himself. That this is the sense of these words, appears still plainer from the quotation of this passage, Matt. 8, 17., where the evangelist employs ἐλάβεν = *He took* our infirmities. And Christ goes through all these sufferings, not because they were forced upon Him, but because He chose to do so by His own free will and choice. This truth is especially emphasized by אָנֹכִי in the original and by αὐτός, *He Himself*, in Matt. 8, 17. Of Christ's vicarious sacrifice the prophet says furthermore, v. 5: *But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed.* Christ was wounded or pierced and bruised; He dies not of a natural but of a violent death, and the verb *pierced*, נִחְרַת, points, as in Ps. 22, 16b, to His crucifixion. He has been killed or crucified for, by, כִּי, our sins, our iniquities and transgressions. Our sins are the thorns in His head, the nails in His hands and feet, the spear in His side, our manifold and innumerable transgressions and iniquities. As our substitute, as our security He paid the penalties of our sins which we were obliged to pay and which would have brought upon us the eternal wrath of the divine Judge. But His wounds, His bruises bring us deliverance, restore peace unto us. For this reason the prophet continues in the same verse: *The chastisement of our peace was upon Him.* After Christ has paid the penalty and has acquired unto us freedom of our heavy guilt, God has no more reason to condemn us for our iniquities and transgression, to cast us away from His face; through Christ He is reconciled with us, His chastisements have settled an amity between God and man, God takes us into friendship and fellowship and thereby peace and all good come to us, Col. 1, 20. He, Christ, is our peace, Eph. 2, 14. And with His stripes we are healed. The prophet presupposes that we have already tasted something of the pain and smart of these wounds and stripes inflicted upon Christ.



All men have to bear the temporal consequences of sin as bodily sickness, poverty, etc. All men have, as they are by nature, an evil conscience, and all men are by nature under the wrath of God, and have to expect but death and damnation. But Christ's suffering is such as to restore unto us a good conscience at peace with God. Christ's death has entirely freed us from hell and damnation and won again for us heaven and eternal bliss and thus also taken the sting, the gall and wormwood out of our earthly woes and miseries. From the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, however, no man is excluded. Christ has suffered for all, as all men are sinners and have come short of the glory of God. And to impress this truth upon our minds, Isaiah proceeds, v. 6: *All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.* The prophet likens men to sheep which have gone astray from their rightful owner and wander about in the wilderness, pursuing their own ways leading to destruction and certain death. Through the fall of our first parents we all, no one excepted, have gone astray, have alienated ourselves from our God and Creator, we have denied to Him the obedience which we owe to Him. But this is not all. Instead of attempting to seek and return to Him, every one has turned to his own way, every one has wandered still farther away from the true God, following stubbornly his own way, his own lusts, and so, in addition to original sin, he has heaped iniquities upon iniquities. But the original sin, as well as the actual sins of all and every one, has God laid or thrust, הִפָּקֵד, upon His Son to atone for them, and there is in truth no sin for which Christ has not paid a ransom, no sin, either, which God has not laid upon Him.

Christ suffers by His own free will, but it is likewise true that He submits Himself to this great suffering in obedience to the will of His heavenly Father whose wisdom had conceived this plan of redemption for lost and lorn

mankind, and not only for some, as Calvin has taught, but for every individual of the human race. In the following verse the prophet describes again, as in chap. 50, 6, the admirable patience and willingness which Christ exhibited in all His suffering and the hard usage which He received at the hands of sinners. V. 7: *He was oppressed, and He was afflicted, yet He opened not His mouth: He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so He openeth not His mouth.* Christ was oppressed or treated cruelly, as for instance the Israelites were oppressed by their task masters in Egypt. He was afflicted, or, since the נחם in the original marks a contrast: yet He bowed Himself, that is, He suffered Himself to be oppressed although He could have easily made resistance. In His great meekness and willingness to suffer He opened not His mouth as the prophet assures us twice in this verse, and resembled therein a lamb which is brought to the slaughter and a sheep under the hard hands of her shearer. He was bound, led before the council of the Jewish people, before Herod and Pilate, they led Him out to Calvary, the place where He was to be crucified, and Christ bore all this with silence, without upbraiding or cursing His enemies for doing what they did, and without using His power to take revenge on them, and when He opened His mouth, when He spoke, it was to bear testimony to the truth, to pray and even to make intercession for His enemies, to speak warning and comforting words to His friends. Alluding to this prophecy St. Peter says 1 Pet. 2, 22. 23 of Christ: *Who did not sin, neither was guile found in His mouth: who, when He was reviled, reviled not again, when He suffered, He threatened not; but committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously.* His example Christians should follow. But above everything, because Christ suffered willingly, patiently, His sacrifice is perfect and acceptable to God. Thus He has proved Himself to be the true Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world; thus He has blotted out our in-

iniquities and we are redeemed, redeemed not with silver or gold, but with the precious blood of Christ as a lamb without blemish and without spot. Blessed he that looks upon this Lamb of God, blessed that man who places himself under the cross of Christ acknowledging and confessing his sins, but also accepting and believing in Christ, the Lamb of God, which has likewise taken away his own sins, great and innumerable as they may be.

After the description of Christ's patient, voluntary, and innocent suffering Isaiah in the following verse calls our attention to the Messiah's deliverance, though not without pointing again to some special features of this singular passion. V. 8: *He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare His generation? for He was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was He stricken.* Christ was in prison, or, if we take the original and literal meaning of עֶצֶר, in anguish, He was also under a judicial process. The truth is, neither the highpriest nor Pontius Pilate, who had sentenced Christ to death and delivered Him to the most shameful death of crucifixion, could have harmed Christ in the least if he had not also been arraigned before another tribunal, the tribunal of God Himself. God had pronounced the sentence of death upon Him, God had condemned Him not only to suffer temporal death, but to suffer also all the torments of hell which men should suffer; for this reason He was in exceedingly great anguish, thence all this indescribable woe and misery of His soul. But His agony, His distress was not to last forever. God was satisfied, pleased with it, the suffering of the Son of God on that first, ever memorable, Good-Friday has quenched the wrath of God against men or against their Substitute, it has satisfied the divine righteousness and justice since the godhead of Christ gave to His passion according to His human nature infinite value and weight. When Christ exclaimed on the cross: *It is finished*, his work had been brought to a happy issue, and He was delivered from anguish, He was

taken from the judgment of His heavenly Father. In fact, His death on the cross through which His body and soul were severed was deliverance, release for Him from all His grievous toil and work, it was for the Messiah but a transit into a new, glorious life. So we understand why the prophet continues now with the exclamation: *And who shall declare His generation?* or if we prefer to follow the more literal rendition: *And who shall think out His age?* The answer upon this rhetorical question is certainly: Nobody, no man can count the years of His life: He shall live forever, in all eternity. *He rose*, says the apostle, *to die no more, death hath no more dominion over Him.* The prophet adds: *For He was cut off out of the land of the living.* This explains to us in what manner Christ was taken out of anguish and judgment, namely by a sudden, violent death, the death of an evil-doer. But to prevent all misconception, to engrave it upon our mind forever, that Christ was cut off out of the land of the living not for His sins, but for our transgressions, that His suffering and death were vicarious, while He Himself was innocent, Isaiah adds immediately: *For the transgression of my people was He stricken.* It is another that commits the transgression, the people, and another upon whom the curse, *כּוּרְסָא*, is laid to bear it. Had Christ Himself deserved the curse, had He been cut off out of the land of the living for His sins, God would not have been pleased with Him, neither would His death have brought to Him deliverance, glory, and life forever. These statements, however, concerning Christ's death are followed by an indication of His burial, and we have here, as in the gospels and in the Apostles' Creed, the chronological order: Christ suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried.

V. 9: *And He made His grave with the wicked, and with the rich in His death; because He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth.* He made, or they (the people) gave, designed, *יָצַד*, His grave with the



wicked. This was the intention of Christ's enemies, the Jews, to inter Him with the thieves and murderers. But God had directed it otherwise and set their nefarious plan at naught. Christ was in His death or in His state of death, כִּי, with the rich or with a rich man. עֲשִׂיר means *rich* and is not used here as a synonym of *wicked*, as some would have it. Such a conception would be also quite contrary to history. The evangelists relate unanimously that Joseph of Arimathea, a wealthy and honorable counselor of the Jews and heretofore a secret disciple of Christ, went to Pilate and begged the body of Christ. But having received permission to take it, he wrapped it in a fine, clean linen cloth and laid the body of Christ in his own new tomb which he had hewn out in the rock. Thus Christ received an honorable burial, in the sepulchre of a rich man, and rested there until His resurrection. Christ's burial and rest in the grave belong to His state of humiliation, but at the same time they are to be considered as an allusion, as a prelude to His state of glory very near at hand. God has bestowed this honor upon Him *because He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth*, and testifies by this already that He has accepted the innocent, willing and vicarious offering of His Son, and that Christ has carried out completely and faithfully the work allotted to Him by His heavenly Father.

The following three verses of chap. 53 are in the main a prophecy of Christ's exaltation; but as in the foregoing part of this chapter Isaiah had again and again interwoven with the description of Christ's passion some hints at its future glory, so here again he does not fail to point back to Christ's suffering in every verse, indicating thereby that both subjects stand in the closest relation and that neither of them should be treated without reference being made to the other.

V. 10 reads: *Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him; He hath put Him to grief; when thou shalt make His soul*

*an offering for sin, He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.* It pleased the Lord to bruise or contuse Him, to lay upon Him sickness. Christ's passion is the result of the eternal counsel of God conceived for the salvation of mankind. The highpriests, Pontius Pilate, and all those who participated in the murder of Christ, have committed the most heinous crime ever perpetrated on earth, they have also to bear the consequences of this crime if they did not repent; but, nevertheless, they served also as instruments to carry out God's will and counsel which His wisdom had invented to save men from utter perdition. But when Christ has carried out this counsel of God or, as the prophet says further on, if He has made or given His soul an offering for sin, *He shall see His seed*, etc. Christ indeed offered up His soul as a trespass offering. His soul was the sin offering itself, which He has yielded up for the souls of men unable to give their souls to make satisfaction thereby and to still the just and well deserved wrath of an angry God. And Christ having sacrificed Himself, His soul as well as His body shall have His reward, *He shall see His seed*. His seed or His progeny are the true believers, those that are truly regenerated or converted by means of the incorruptible seed of His word. They are given to Him by His Father as His inheritance. We read, therefore, Ps. 22, 30: *A seed shall serve Him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation.* Christ Himself prays, John 17, 11: *Holy Father, keep through Thine own name those whom Thou hast given me.* It is the Father who draws us to the Son. Of Him, the Son, it is said furthermore: *He shall prolong His days.* Human fathers must often leave their children to the care of others, but Christ lives forever, and forever He shall take care of His progeny, the true believers. Ps. 23. He preserves them so that at the great day of judgment He can step before His heavenly Father and say: *Behold I and the children which God hath given me.* Hebr. 2, 13. Is. 8, 18.

*And the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.* God's counsel shall take effect through Him, in His hand, and not one iota or tittle shall fail, the salvation wrought by Christ shall also be communicated to and enjoyed by sinners. But how this is brought about we shall learn especially from the following verse.

V. 11: *He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied: by His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for He shall bear their iniquities.* Our Lord Jesus Christ was in travail of His soul for our redemption. To bring it about, He put in all His power and strength. With an ardent desire to fulfill all the divine promises He hastened on in His work without ever pausing or resting until all was finished. Now after the travail is over and His work done He shall have the gain, the fruit of His labor. But the fruit of it are we, the true children of God, the Church of Christ. Thus we confess in the second article of our Christian faith with father Luther: Who has purchased and won us from all sin, etc. But seeing of the travail of His soul, He shall be satisfied. It contributes to His glory and fills Him with joy if many enjoy the salvation acquired by Him, if His travail, His labor is not spent in vain. *By His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many.* Through the justification of many shall the counsel of the Lord prosper in Christ's hand. Christ justifies sinners by His knowledge, imparts to them by His knowledge that righteousness which He has acquired for us. It is the knowledge of those things which the prophet has just told us concerning the Servant of the Lord, it is the preaching of the Cross, as the prophet plainly suggests, continuing: *For he shall bear their iniquities.* In all the world Christ has His gospel preached, which possesses the inherent power to produce faith in the hearts of men. Those, however, who accept the gospel and believe in Christ as their Savior are justified, they are robed in Christ's righteousness, this righteousness is imparted to them and

they have and enjoy the forgiveness of sins. But where there is forgiveness of sins, there is also life and salvation. The last verse of chap. 53 reads: *Therefore will I divide Him a portion with the great, and He shall divide the spoil with the strong; because He hath poured out His soul unto death: and He was numbered with the transgressors; and He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.* Therefore, לִבְנֵי, because Christ has borne the sins of so many, of all men, God promises here to divide Him a portion with the great, or apportion to Him the many. By the many those are again meant, of whom the prophet had spoken in verses 10 and 11, the seed, the progeny of the Messiah, those whom the Servant of the Lord justifies. They are His portion, the portion which the Father has assigned to Him as a reward and recompense for all His labors and toil. As all these many are His children, so they are His property, He is their Lord. But the consequence of this again is: *And He shall divide the spoil with the strong.* Enemies of the Lord, proud and rebellious sinners, who had raged and revolted against the Lord and His anointed, shall be subdued to Christ, they shall be converted, and then they shall also share with Christ the fruit and reward of His labor. He leads them to life eternal and to the participation of the glory which He has received at the hands of His Father. Christ says, therefore, John 17, 22: *And the glory which Thou gavest me, I have given them;* and, John 17, 24: *Father, I will that they also, whom Thou hast given me, be with me where I am.* But since Christ's glory and the salvation, eternal blessedness and glory, of the true believers are the fruit and consequence of nothing else than Christ's suffering, the prophet points once more to it and concludes the grand and incomparable picture of Christ's Great Passion with the words: *Because He hath poured out His soul unto death: and He was numbered with the transgressors; and He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the*



*transgressors*. Christ's Passion, the yielding up of His soul to voluntary death, the shame He bore while He was counted with the transgressors, the intercession He makes for the sinners, are the source and fountainhead of all bliss and happiness which the true believers enjoy even now, and of all blessedness and glory, great beyond all expectation, which they shall enjoy in all eternity, and no knowledge, no wisdom in all the world should be dearer and more precious to us, to the preachers as well as to the hearers of the word, than that which Isaiah teaches in his 53d chapter.

J. HOENESS.

---

## AN APOSTOLIC LESSON IN CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

1 PET. 2, 11—20.

(Epistolary Lesson for the Third Sunday after Easter.)

The apostle Peter addresses his First Epistle "to the *strangers* scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, *elect* according to the foreknowledge of God." (1, 1. 2.)

These Christians are styled "strangers," "elect strangers." *Strangers* they were because they lived scattered in various countries of the Gentiles. They were strangers in a strange land. The principal reason, however, why the apostle applied this name to them was because they still lived in the world. Christians, all true Christians, are strangers and pilgrims, so Scripture describes them.

As strangers these Christians of Asia Minor were despised, hated, and oftentimes persecuted by the Gentiles. Theirs was not an enviable lot. But they were *elect* strangers, chosen out of the *massa perditionis* by God to be His own. Hence, though they were *strangers* and therefore hated by men, they were *elect* strangers, highly honored of God. That was a strong consolation on their miserable pilgrimage.

The peculiarly lofty dignity of these Christians the apostle describes thus: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light: which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy." (2, 9. 10.)

Then follows our lesson beginning with the earnest exhortation: "Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul." (V. 11.)

What is the connection of this admonition with the previous context? You are Christians, you have been called from darkness to light, you are strangers and pilgrims in this world, therefore prove by your walk that you really believe that you are pilgrims wandering towards the Celestial City. Make it manifest by your conversation that this earth is indeed a strange land unto you. (V. 11.)

He tells them furthermore that one purpose of leading an honest conversation should be to win others for Christ (v. 12) and in the succeeding verses he teaches them how to discharge their duties in the various stations of life.

V. 11: Ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους, ἀπέχεσθε τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς.

"Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul."

In order to make the exhortation all the more impressive the apostle assures his readers of his love by addressing them: "*Dearly beloved.*" Peter would say, "Love for your immortal souls impels me to administer the subsequent admonition. It is your best interests that I have in view." And the wise pastor who loves the flock over

which he has been made overseer will learn from the apostle, imitate his example, and frequently assure his parishioners of the fact that though he may have to say things seemingly harsh, love for their eternal welfare prompts him to do so. He will speak the truth in love. "*I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims.*" All true Christians are strangers and pilgrims in this world. Heaven is their home; the goal of their pilgrimage is that "inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away." (1, 4.) "Hear my prayer, O Lord," says David, Ps. 39, 12, "and give ear unto my cry; hold not thy peace at my tears: for I am a stranger with thee and a sojourner, as all my fathers were." And in Hebrews 11, speaking of the saints of the Old Testament, we read: "They confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city." (Vv. 13—16.)

Such being the character of the Christians it behooves them to keep aloof from those things that belong to the world. An American citizen sojourning in a foreign country should so conduct himself as not to cast reproach upon his native country. A Christian, who is a "fellow-citizen of the saints" (Eph. 2, 19), should so walk in this world as to do credit to Christ and His Church. "Give none offense," says St. Paul, "neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God." Therefore the Apostle says:

"*Abstain from fleshly lusts.*" These ἐπιθυμίαι, desires, lusts, are called fleshly σαρκικάι, because they have their seat in the flesh, in the σάρξ, the sinful, depraved nature of man. They comprise not only the gross transgressions of the sixth commandment but also many sins which reason may not account sin, as, for instance, unbelief, distrust, despair,

hatred and contempt of God, idolatry, etc. From these fleshly lusts the Christian pilgrim is to abstain; he is to fight against them, to suppress them by the power of God. Christians only can be thus admonished. Natural man finds his home, his heaven, here upon earth. With him fleshly lusts are the ruling principle. St. Paul, writing to the Ephesians, says: "Among whom" (the heathen) "also we all had our conversation in times past in the lust of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." The nature, the condition of man, is evil and from it results a corresponding evil conduct. Natural man is dead in trespasses and sin. He is altogether flesh. He knows of no higher delight than to fulfill the desires of the flesh. He is a slave and stands under the sway of the flesh. The Christian, however, has been freed from the dominion of the flesh. He still has the *σάρξ*, the flesh, and therefore will be assailed by fleshly lusts; but through the power of the Spirit, through the power of God, he suppresses them and abstains therefrom. He is no longer a debtor to the flesh, to live after the flesh, but through the Spirit mortifies the deeds of the body. (Rom. 8, 12. 13.)

The Christian pilgrim hears strains of the siren's song of the world, he feels inclined to halt and listen to the alluring but illusive music, he reminds himself, however, of his true character as a stranger and pilgrim, and abstains from fleshly lusts. If the flesh broods vengeance over some real or imaginary wrong, if bitter words come to the lips with which to hurt his neighbor, he bridles his tongue and thus abstains from fleshly lusts. And though at times he is allured into bypaths, he does not allow the flesh to dominate over him, and through the mercy of God his feet are set aright on the paths of righteousness. Daily he learns to pray more fervently: "Lead us not into temptation."

Oh, an earnest admonition this: "*Abstain from fleshly lusts.*" Why? Peter adduces the reason: "*They war*



*against the soul.*'' War presupposes enemies. The enemies lined up in battle array are the fleshly lusts, and the *soul*, this priceless jewel, is the object for which they are contending. If you do not abstain from fleshly lusts, says the apostle, the latter are victorious, your soul is lost! And that we are in great danger of losing the soul we perceive from the impressive earnestness of the exhortation: "*I beseech you, abstain from fleshly lusts.*" Therefore,

"My soul, be on thy guard;  
 Ten thousand foes arise,  
 And hosts of sin are pressing hard  
 To draw thee from the skies.  
 O watch, and fight, and pray,  
 The battle ne'er give o'er;  
 Renew it boldly every day  
 And help divine implore."

V. 12: *Τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλήν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν, ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύσαντες δοξάσωσιν τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς.*

"Having your manner of life good among the Gentiles that in the matter in which they speak against you as evil-doers, they may through your good works which they have seen, glorify God in the day of visitation."

In this verse the apostle approaches the central thought of the entire section. In order to follow the admonition therein contained what was said in the preceding verse formed the necessary condition. Now just what does the apostle here say? Is the meaning simply this that they should adorn their profession by a walk in sanctification? That too is included. But to a walk in the newness of life the apostle had previously admonished them. He had exhorted them, e. g., "to show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness to his marvelous light." Here an entirely new thought finds expression. Peter does not merely say: "Have your conversation honest," but he adds the significant words: "*among the Gentiles.*" So,

then, says the apostle, they should pay particular attention to that phase of their mode of life which was patent to the heathen, which would appear good in their eyes, of which the Gentiles could judge whether it be good or evil. In these matters they ought to be exceedingly careful not to give offense. What purpose should they have in view? "*That they (the heathen) may glorify God.*" So, then, the ultimate object to be attained by their good conversation was the conversion of the heathen. Conversion is the work of God alone. It is wrought through the Word. But the good works of the Christians testify of the change of heart wrought in the Christians by the Spirit through the Word. They are an object sermon. They testify of faith, of Christ. The Christians preach the Gospel and lead a holy life according to it. The heathen, the non-Christians, do not read the Bible, but they read the life of the Christians. Perceiving their holy conversation they are constrained to confess: We cannot live as the Christians do. Thus they may be induced to inquire after the source of this good mode of life. Its source is faith. Upon further reflection they perceive that this faith is generated by the Word of God. This may impel them to hear the Word of God, and, coming under the all-powerful influence of the Word, God generates faith in them where and when it pleaseth Him. Thus the matter which at first seemed to give the heathen ground for reviling the Christians became the ground of glorifying God "in the day of visitation."

As the text indicates the Christians were spoken against as *evil-doers*. How did that come about? The Christians spoke of Christ, their King. The heathen, ignorant of the Christian religion, reasoned: The Christians acknowledging Christ as their King deny obedience to our king, to our emperor: they are evil-doers. The Christians spoke of a kingdom to which they belonged, so the heathen concluded: They are opposed to our government; they are evil-doers. Again, the Christians would not bow their knees to the idols

of the heathen, nor would they worship the statues of the emperor. And again the heathen concluded: "These Christians despise our religion and our emperor. This whole Christian religion is rebellion!"

How should they conduct themselves over against such and similar calumnies? "Have your manner of life as one good among the Gentiles that in the matter in which they speak against you as evil-doers they may see your works." In those matters in which they revile you as evil-doers, prove by your walk that they lie. Finally the truth will be victorious. They will see that it was simply owing to their ignorance that they jumped at conclusions and spread false reports concerning you. If, for example, they say the Christian religion is rebellion, prove by your mode of life that you are law-abiding citizens (cf. vv. 13—15). Constrain them to confess, if not publicly, still tacitly: It is true, these Christians speak of Christ as their King, and of the kingdom of Christ, but they are not opposed to our government. They do not bow to our idols, it is true, but nevertheless they are faithful subjects of the crown.

And the Christian servants (vv. 18 ff.) were to lead an honest conversation among the Gentiles by being obedient also to the froward masters, so that the heathen would be compelled to say: They are not evil-doers but the best of servants. Thus the heathen would be led to see the error of their ways, and what was at first a ground for evil-speaking might become the cause of giving glory to God "in the day of visitation." That is one purpose of the good works of the Christians: to win others for Christ. In the Sermon on the Mount the Lord says, Matt. 5, 16: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

Luther says: "Observe the fine order St. Peter maintains. He has taught us what we must do to suppress the flesh and all its lusts; now he also teaches why this should be done. Why shall I suppress my flesh? In order

to be saved? No, but in order to lead an honest conversation before the world. The good mode of life does not make us pious before God, but we must be pious previously and believe before we can begin to lead a godly life. Therefore I should not lead an honest conversation to atone for sin and merit salvation, but in order that the heathen might be bettered and incited through us to come to Christ (which is a work of true love). They slander and revile us and account us the greatest knaves; therefore we should lead such a seemly conversation as to constrain them to confess: 'We can find no fault with them.''' (St. L. ed., IX, p. 1196.)

What the apostle writes to the Christians of Asia Minor is applicable also to the Christians of to-day.. We belong to that "sect that everywhere is spoken against" (Acts 28, 22). "Sanctimonious people," "hypocrites," are epithets applied to the Christians by the unbelievers. In periodicals, in books, from the rostrum, and from behind the beer-glass, the scoffers vent their venom upon Christ and Christianity. And if perchance they know of one black sheep in the fold, this is reason enough to condemn the whole flock. One Judas casts reproach upon all disciples of Christ.

These vilifications will never entirely cease. Like master, like servant. Even He who could boldly challenge His adversaries, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" (John 8, 46) was He not decried as "a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners"? (Matt. 11, 19.) Small wonder if we suffer likewise. Nevertheless we should earnestly strive to have our "manner of life good among the Gentiles," and thus put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. The godly life of the followers of Christ is a powerful object sermon for those without, which may bear wonderful results. The cock's crow reminded Peter of his deep fall and brought tears of repentance to his eyes. God oftentimes employs insignificant means to bring about great re-



sults. The good works of the Christians may oftentimes be the reason which ultimately induces unbelievers to embrace Christianity.

Ours is a materialistic age. The idol before whose shrine everybody is supposed to worship is "the almighty dollar." "Make money," is the motto of the non-Christians. Make money by hook or crook, by means fair or foul, just so you escape the clutches of the law. What shall we eat? What shall we drink? Wherewithal shall we be clothed?—after these things do the Gentiles seek. Christian pilgrims, know your calling! On the way to the heavenly Canaan do not be misled to bow to this golden calf. Have your conversation honest among the Gentiles. Prove by your walk that you really believe that He who clothes the lilies and the grass of the field will also provide for you.

Again, our age is an age of revelry, debauchery, and uncleanness. Know your calling, Christian pilgrims, and "have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." (Eph. 5, 11.) In short, we should so conduct ourselves that the words of the apostle may be applied to us: "They think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot" (1 Pet. 4, 4).

Vv. 13. 14: Ὑποτάγητε οὖν πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον, εἴτε βασιλεῖ, ὡς ὑπερέχοντι, εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν, ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν.

"Submit yourselves therefore to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well."

The general exhortation contained in vv. 11. 12 are now specialized. Strangers and pilgrims ought to conform to the usages and customs of those countries through which their pilgrimage leads them if they be not contrary to the

Word of God. In the world through which the Christian pilgrims wander there are ordinances, institutions, which are good and laudable. And by conforming themselves thereto the Christians "have their conversation honest among the Gentiles." This is the connection in thought between the general and the special exhortations, as may be seen from the little word *οὖν, therefore*, of v. 13.

"Submit yourselves," says the apostle. So submission, subjection, obedience is inculcated. Obedience to what? "To every ordinance of man." What is meant by "ordinance of man" the words following indicate: "whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him." The passage speaks of submission to kings and governors, it treats of obedience to civil government. Romans 13, 1 treats of the same matter. There we read: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." It is immaterial in what person or persons this higher power may be vested, whether in a monarch, or in the people at large, wherever government is established it is the duty of the subjects to be obedient to those clothed with authority. "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's." Matt. 22, 21.

And what should impel Christians to submit to this ordinance of man? Peter says: Submit for the Lord's sake, for Christ's sake. If Christians would not render obedience to civil rulers, they would thereby cast reproach upon their Master, for the heathen would justly speak of them as evil-doers, and thus their Lord would be blasphemed through them.

What should prompt the Christians to submit to this ordinance? *διὰ τὸν κύριον*, says Peter, "for the Lord's, for Christ's sake." For if they would not be subject to the government the heathen would justly speak of them as evil-doers. "The King of the Christians, Christ," they would

say, "incites his followers to rebellion." Thus their Lord would be blasphemed. But by honoring this ordinance of man, Christ would be honored at the same time.

"*Whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him.*" The word βασιλεύς (king) signifies rulers in general and is here used to designate the Roman emperor. So above all they should render obedience to the king, as the one having supreme power, but also to the governors, the praetors, the proconsuls, as the organs through whom the king exercised his sway. In short, they should submit to all in authority, to high and low officials. It is oftentimes very difficult to obey the petty officials—their characters, their foibles and shortcomings being known to us, but we must remember they are clothed with authority.

What is the object of government? "*For (εἰς) the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well.*" What is to be understood by *evil-doing*, and what by *well-doing*? Nero is emperor, he sends his praetors to punish evil-doing. Nero, the profligate and bloodhound, discerns good and evil. The government of which Peter speaks is a heathen government. How did Nero distinguish between good and evil? By his reason. This section, therefore, treats of the *justitia civilis* only, of what is good or bad in civil life. And notwithstanding that the emperor is a heathen, Peter acknowledges his authority and demands obedience thereto on the part of the Christians. In the eyes of the law there are well-doers and evil-doers, good citizens and bad citizens. And the right to inflict punishment rests with civil government. Hence "lynch-law," which is resorted to to such an alarming extent in our country, is utterly to be condemned. Lynch-law does not administer justice and punish crime, but is itself a violation of justice. It is not only a crime against human law, but also a sin against the commandment of God, "Thou shalt not kill."

V. 15: "Οτι οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀγαθοποιοῦντας φειμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνοσίαν.

"For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men."

This verse states the reason for submission. For *so*, οὕτως, *in this manner*, by well-doing in civil life, by being good, law-abiding citizens they were to silence the ignorance of their adversaries. The heathen lacked the comprehension of Christian life. In this their ignorance, their foolishness consisted. And because they did not understand the Christian religion nor the life resultant therefrom, they imagined that the characteristic of the Christians was evil-doing, not well-doing; that it was opposition and not submission to the powers that be. But by perceiving their upright, honest conversation the heathen would be forced to see the utter foolishness of the accusations made against the Christians, and thus these senseless calumnies would cease. Thus to silence the ignorance of foolish men, says Peter, *is the will of God*. In a previous verse (v. 13) he had said: Submit to those in authority *for the Lord's*, for Christ's, *sake*, in order that your Master, Christ, be not blasphemed. Here he says, "it is *the will of God*," and thus adds an additional motive for subjection. God has instituted this ordinance and hence you must submit thereto.

V. 16: 'Ὡς ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς δοῦλοι θεοῦ.

"As free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God."

*As free*. This is to be connected with *be subject* of v. 13, or with *do well* of v. 15. The sense in both cases is essentially the same. Christians are *free* in the full sense of the word. They are free from the curse of the Law (Gal. 3, 13), free from the dominion of sin (Rom. 6, 12—14), and they are in possession of Christian liberty (Gal. 5, 1. Col. 2, 16. 17). They are free children of God. Their submission to authority is not that of slaves, but as of those who have



attained freedom in Christ. The Christians, becoming conscious of their high prerogatives, therefore willingly, gladly submit themselves in these earthly matters which have nothing to do with their faith, "for the Lord's sake" (v. 13), and because "it is the will of God" (v. 15). *Not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God.* Suppose the Christian should argue thus: "I am a free child of God, and hence I need not submit to the tyrannical rule of a Nero,"—this logic, the apostle says, would be utterly wrong. Such a procedure would not be in consonance with their Christianity, but the latter would be merely made to serve as a splendid cloak with which to hide their malice (*κακία*). For opposition to the government is malice. No, says Peter, you are *free* children of God and hence you will *serve* God also in this matter by submitting yourselves voluntarily to the civil power. Non-submission would be an abuse of your Christian liberty.

Luther aptly says: "This is said especially for us, who have heard of Christian freedom, that we may not go on and abuse this freedom, making a cloak of it; that is to say, under the name and show of Christian freedom do all that we lust after."

V. 17: Πάντας τιμήσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπᾶτε, τὸν θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε.

"Honor all. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king."

*Honor all* according to their position and calling. *Love the brotherhood.* Love in its full sense can only be accorded to them that have the same spirit as we, who are one in the faith with us. To such only can we open our whole heart and confer with them in a brotherly manner. No Christian should say concerning a manifest unbeliever, "He is my friend, my brother." We should honor those who are without the brotherhood, but otherwise have nothing more to do with them than insofar as is necessary not "to go out of the world." (1 Cor. 5, 9, 10.) But does not the Lord

say: "Love your enemies"? "The apparent contradiction of Matt. 5, 44, here presented, where love to enemies is also enjoined, is to be explained on the following principle: that the ἀγάπη is differently conditioned, according as it has different objects. In perfect harmony with its inmost nature, it can exist only between Christians, for only among them is there community of life in God; cf. chap. 1, 22." (Meyer in loco.)

*Fear God. Fear is more than honor.* Fear is due to God. Hence, above all render to God the things that are God's. *Honor the king.* To fear God and honor the king are not things incompatible with each other. On the contrary. But we must observe: *fear is more than honor.* Obedience to the king, to those who are in authority under God, must cease where such obedience would demand a transgression of a clear commandment of God. There the exhortation obtains: *Fear God.* Setting aside the will and commandment of the civil rulers in order to obey the King of kings, Peter and the other apostles said to the high-priest and to the captain of the temple and the chief priests at Jerusalem: "We ought to obey God rather than men." (Acts 5, 29.)

This closes the subsection in which the apostle admonishes his readers as subjects to render obedience to the government. Doing this they would "have their conversation honest among the Gentiles" and thus might lead others to embrace Christianity. (V. 12.)

In the following section the apostle addresses the servants and, carrying out the same train of thought contained in v. 12, shows them how they in their humble sphere of life may let their light shine before men that they may see their good works and glorify the Father which is in heaven. Matt. 5, 16.

V. 18: Οἱ οἰκέται, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις, οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἐπιεικέσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς σχολιοῖς.

"Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward."

The apostle enlarges upon the relation between masters and servants and exhorts the latter to well-doing.

*Servants*, οἰκέται, is a milder term for δοῦλοι, *slaves*. They are here described as ὑποτασσόμενοι, *subordinate*.

Christians should submit to every ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει (v. 13). This relation of master and servant is also ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει. Remember, the apostle would say, they are the *masters*, the superiors; you are the *servants*, the inferiors. Because they are the *masters* you must be subject to them. And be subject *in all fear*. Φόβος, *fear*, is the consciousness of inferiority under a power whose authority it is dangerous to disregard. Be fearful, lest you transgress the will of your master; do your duty faithfully and honestly. Do not believe you have a right to despise them because you are Christians and they are heathen. Acting thus would be an abuse of your Christian liberty. They have authority over you, they are your *masters* and hence have a right to your service. This subjection they owe not only to the kind and gentle masters—this is a comparatively easy matter—but also to the *σκολιοί*, the *unfair* or *unjust*, who scarcely are to be pleased at all, who are almost continually nagging and finding fault with you. This harsh, unjust treatment on the part of these froward masters does not change your relation to them, nor does it justify you in disregarding their power.

But, since this is a very difficult lesson to learn, the apostle adduces reasons why they should obey their masters in all fear in order to encourage them to follow the exhortation willingly.

V. 19: Τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις, εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας πάσχαυ ἀδίκως.

"For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully."

The special meaning "grace" is not to be attached to the word *χάρις* here, as though the clause were to be explained thus: "It is to be regarded as grace, if one can suffer for the sake of God." (Steiger, cf. Meyer in loco.) The expression *τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις*, in v. 19, and *τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῷ* are parallel with each other. And the parallelism shows that the meaning of *χάρις* can only be *acceptable, well-pleasing*. Thus also Gerhard: "Hoc est Deo gratum et acceptum." If the Christian servants were patient under their hardships, while they suffered wrongfully, this patient suffering would be well-pleasing in the eyes of God. And since it is the Christian's greatest concern to be acceptable to God, this reason for being subject also to the froward masters afforded great consolation to the servants.

But why is it said: This is thankworthy, if a man *for conscience toward God*, *εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ*, endure grief? *συνείδησις* means *conscience, consciousness*. This knowledge of a certain fact, this consciousness stands in a certain relation to God, therefore it reads: *διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ*. *θεοῦ* is object. gen. Calov tersely remarks: "Quia conscius est, id Deum velle et Deo gratum esse." So the explanation of the phrase would be: I am conscious of this that it is the will of God that I, the Christian servant, ought to be obedient to the froward masters also, and patiently suffer wrongs; and, therefore, I submit myself for conscience' sake, in the fear of God, who has placed these masters, also the froward, over me as my superiors.

This patient endurance of unmerited wrongs, Peter says, is well-pleasing to God. If, on the other hand, the servants would submit to wrongs simply because by the force of circumstances they could not do otherwise, this would not be acceptable to God.

In order forcefully to bring home the truth in this statement, the apostle appeals to the judgment of his readers. He says:

V. 20: Ποῖον γὰρ κλέος, εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ χολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιοῦντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ.

"For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God."

Take a supposed case. The Christian servant sins; he is punished for his disobedience and takes it patiently. Is there any glory? No, he has acted contrary to the will of God, contrary to the will of his master, and when punished receives but his just deserts. But, per contra, "when ye do well and suffer for it, and take it patiently, this is acceptable with God."

The Christian "*does well*," but nevertheless is made to *suffer*. For what reason does he suffer? He has been obedient to his master, he has done "*well!*" Obedience is not a cause of suffering. Why, then, was punishment inflicted upon him? Because he is a Christian. Hatred to Christ and Christianity, his faith in Christ, was the cause that enflamed the froward master to vent his spleen upon the faithful servant against whom he could find no fault. If you suffer thus for Christ's sake, says Peter, and take it patiently, and notwithstanding this ill-treatment from your master, serve him in all fear, this patient endurance is acceptable with God. And the Christian servants bearing this in mind would be consoled with their lot, would be strengthened and fortified to bear the undeserved hatred of their superiors.

L. W.

---



## Practical Theology.

---

### THE PASTOR AND THE LABOR QUESTION.

The labor question is one of the burning questions of the day. It is one of the great social problems with which many a busy mind has been grappling, and which is to-day as far from a satisfactory solution as it ever was at any previous time, a problem which, it is safe to say, will never be satisfactorily solved in this world of sin and selfishness. But the day may come, and may not be far distant, when this Gordian knot will be violently cut asunder, not with the sword of a Macedonian ruler, but with axes and cleavers in the callous hands of laboring men.

As a social problem, the labor question concerns every member of human society, the Christian pastor not excluded, and if superior intelligence and a wider field of vision are advantages which he enjoys before many of his fellow-men, it would seem proper that the Christian minister should be better informed concerning the various phases and the present status of the labor question than many who feel that they and the like of them were holding a lease on the interests of labor and all the ways and means therewith connected. It is therefore eminently proper that the minister as a citizen and an intelligent member of the community should make himself in a fair measure familiar with the fundamentals of social science, the great leading principles underlying the phenomena of industrial life and with these phenomena as related to such principles.

On the other hand, in his official capacity of a spiritual adviser, as a teacher and guide whose proper task and purpose is to lead immortal souls through the kingdom of grace to the kingdom of glory, the pastor should consider the secular interests of the labor question and of every other

social problem entirely foreign to his peculiar sphere. The kingdom for which, in war and in peace, his official services are enlisted, is not of this world. The doctrines which he is to promulgate and inculcate are not those of political economy and social science, but of theology. His authorities are not Smith and Ricardo and Say and Carey, but Moses and the prophets, the apostles and evangelists. It is not his business to discuss the expediency of trade unions, of strikes and boycotts, of walking delegates and traveling cards, from secular points of view, any more than it is within his pastoral province to preach on the merits or demerits of Swiss or Elgin watches, animal or vegetable diet, beer, wine, or soda water, brass or stringed instruments, single or double entry bookkeeping, or the management of a newspaper.

And yet it may become a pastor's duty to take a member of his congregation to task for mismanagement of his paper, for malfeasance in bookkeeping, for the use or abuse of his violin, for his consumption of beer or wine, for his dealings in watches or jewelry. If the importer of watches or diamonds defraud the government of its revenues, if wine or beer be taken or dispensed to others to excess, if the violinist furnish music for the orgies of a riotous company, if the bookkeeper make fraudulent entries to conceal his own or other people's thefts, or if the publisher of a newspaper prostitute his sheet to the interests of a lascivious stage and ungodly societies and amusements, the pastor must not shirk his duty by ignoring these things as foreign to his proper province, or allow himself to be silenced by the sinner's objection that other people's watches and beverages, fiddles and account books, and publications, were none of the pastor's business. Thus, also, when business corporations or trade unions pursue their aims or choose and use their ways and means in violation and defiance of the law of God, and members of his congregation are in danger of fellowship with such unfruitful works of darkness, a faithful pastor,

whom God has *made a watchman unto the house of Israel*,<sup>1)</sup> will not hesitate to *warn the righteous man, that the righteous sin not*.<sup>2)</sup> If in consequence of a pastor's neglect of duty in this point any member of his flock go astray and lose his soul, his blood shall be required of the pastor's hand.<sup>3)</sup> Where danger threatens the fold, a sleeping watchman is worse than no watchman at all. Hence, when a social movement is fraught with a multitude of sins, it is incumbent upon the Christian minister to have an eye on that movement and to warn his people in due time to beware of the snares of Satan, lest they be entangled and come to grief. And as a thing may be sinful in its nature, or, while good in itself, may be so bound up with sinful circumstances that it cannot be used without sin, it is the pastor's duty to inform himself on the nature of industrial organizations, their aims and methods, on the nature, the theory and practice, of strikes and lock-outs and other measures employed by these organizations for the accomplishment of their purposes. And this is by no means an easy task. This knowledge cannot be acquired by an occasional talk with laborers or their employers, nor by the perusal of a popular work on trade unions, or some treatise on political economy, nor from "what the papers say." Even a painstaking investigation from what may be looked upon as the most reliable sources accessible may lead to not very satisfactory results. In 1867 a Royal Commission was appointed in England "to inquire into the organization and rules of Trade Unions and other Associations, whether of workmen or employers, and into the effect produced by such Unions and Associations on the workmen and employers respectively, on the relations between workmen and employers, and on the trade and industry of the country." The investigation was carried on in 1867, 1868, and 1869. The commissioners scrutinized the constitutions and laws of

---

1) Ezek. 3, 17.

2) Ezek. 3, 21.

3) Ezek. 3, 20.

the Societies, directed a series of questions to 332 secretaries of Trade Unions, and examined a number of witnesses of more or less authority. The results of the inquiry were recorded in eleven blue-books and several supplementary documents. And yet the reliability of the information thus obtained was questioned or denied by both sides; the inquiry and the legislation subsequent thereto had not been completed more than a few months, when a new investigation proved necessary and a second Royal Commission was appointed. "This Inquiry," says an author, "simply brought up anew the critical questions that had been investigated to the core by the Royal Commission of 1867; and there was little or nothing to be expected from it but some amendments of statutory detail, in which the plank of reform was so narrow that, in giving an inch of right in one direction, there might be danger of giving an ell of wrong in another to the working man."<sup>1)</sup> And when we come to treatises, to books and pamphlets and articles, based upon such and similar investigations, the result is even less encouraging. One author asserts what the other denies. One author makes statements as these: "There is not a particle of evidence to the present hour that this beaver-like activity has had the smallest appreciable effect in accomplishing any of their prime objects, either of advancing wages or shortening the hours of labor."<sup>2)</sup> "Nothing is more difficult than to discover in the voluminous evidence of 1867—9 or later facts, any advantage gained to the men by the costly proceedings of their Unions. The failures of strikes, with all their heavy loss of wages and funds, are much more numerous than the partial successes and compromises by which these disastrous events have sometimes been terminated. Thus Mr. Robinson of the Atlas Works, Manchester, on being asked, 'Whether the Unions have substantially altered the rate of wages?'"<sup>3)</sup> re-

---

1) R. Somers, the Trade Unions, p. 9.

2) Ibid. p. 69.

3) Question 18,988.

plied, 'I think not.' This witness laid before the Commission a table of rates of wages paid to all classes of skilled workmen in his branch of trade from 1851 to 1866; from which it appeared that the advances during that lengthened period were immaterial in all classes save one."<sup>1</sup>) "While it is thus clear the Unions cannot permanently advance wages, it might have been supposed that they would have had some success in making wages more uniform in their respective trades over all parts of the kingdom where they exerted any influence. Even this moderate effect, however, cannot be traced to their action in any perceptible degree."<sup>2</sup>) Another author says, "It seems so natural that combination should raise wages, that one is amazed such a position can be questioned."<sup>3</sup>) "Throughout the length and breadth of the land the trade unions have, during the past thirty or forty years, forced wages up."<sup>4</sup>) "Their fitness to attain that object is abundantly proved by the brilliant success which has characterized their efforts."<sup>5</sup>) Statements as contradictory as these might be multiplied, that they are irreconcilable is evident. But how is the reader to decide which is true and which is false? The average reader cannot even let the majority decide; for the majority of works on the subject are not within his reach. And if they were, a decision reached by such a process would be a very precarious basis of action; for majorities have often been wrong and minorities right. And yet the matter is of such importance that action under false supposition may lead to mistakes of far-reaching consequence, a drifting and stumbling into positions to hold or to abandon which would be equally, though in various ways, disastrous to all concerned. Under these circumstances the wisest or only wise thing to do might seem doing nothing at all and letting the whole subject severely alone. And this is precisely what

---

1) Somers, *ibid.* pp. 69 f.

2) *Ibid.* p. 73.

3) William Trant, *Trade Unions*, p. 68.

4) *Ibid.* p. 71.

5) *Ibid.* p. 125.



many, perhaps most of us, have been doing and are doing to-day.

Still it is not the proper thing to do, and for various reasons. In the first place the case is not so hopeless as it would seem to be in view of what has been submitted in the premises. Great as the difficulties are with which we have to cope, they are not insurmountable. That a task cannot be accomplished in a day is no reason why we should let it alone when we have weeks and months and years to work in. The present writer has given a fair share of his time during twenty years to the study of the social problems of which the labor question is one, and it has been his good fortune to have most of the more eminent works on these subjects within easy reach. But while his observation has been that there is probably no province of human speculation, except, perhaps, so-called scientific theology, as amazingly loaded down with fallacies and false conclusions as social science, he has, on the other hand, learned that all the social problems ultimately rest upon a comparatively small number of fixed principles, and that the most careful scrutiny of social phenomena will invariably substantiate the maxim that what comes nearest to full conformity with the moral law is also most conducive to the temporal welfare of human society and its individual members.

The chief fundamental principles upon which the labor problem must be based are chiefly two, JUSTICE and CHARITY. That the labor question is in the deplorable state in which we have it before us to-day is due chiefly to the violation of these principles by those who have made the solution of the labor problem their peculiar business. Justice and charity are being set aside by all the contending parties in the industrial struggles of the age, and when injustice is fought by injustice, and selfishness by selfishness, the victory, whose ever it may be, is little cause of rejoicing. *Righteousness exalteth a people.*<sup>1)</sup>

---

1) Prov. 14, 34.

There is a difference, however, between incidental injustice in practice and injustice by principle. Employers of labor have been and are in many cases unjust in practice, taking undue advantage of their laborers, and they have their judgment in such dicta as Jer. 22, 13 and James 5, 4. But the Trade Unions of our day must be charged with injustice by principle, and by practice consistent with unjust principles, false practice in accordance with false doctrine.

To fully understand this it is necessary that we go back to the theory of industrial production.

Every effect produced within this world of created things is determined by the sum of its concurrent causes and by the difference between these causes and the sum of all the agencies counteracting them. To exemplify: the motion of a loaded wagon drawn by two horses is an effect produced by various causes concurring in its production. There is the power applied by the two horses; not the power applied by the one horse only but that *plus* the power applied by the other horse, both acting concurrently, drawing in the same direction. But the horse-power applied is not sufficient to account for the motion of the wagon. If it were, the same power would secure the same velocity of all wagons, loaded or empty, up-hill or down-hill, on a paved road or in mud up to the axle. As the wagon moves onward, the velocity increases without an increase of the horse-power applied, because of the *vis inertiae* and the *momentum* of the wagon and its load. When the wagon moves down an inclined plane, the motion is accelerated by the force of gravitation, whatever that may be, acting upon every particle of matter in the wagon and its load. And while this power remains practically the same, the velocity of the wagon increases as it rolls down the incline, because of the concurrence of the continued power of gravitation, the *vis inertiae* of the wagon and load, and the increasing *momentum* of the descending bodies. These causes may even render the application of horse-power as

a moving force entirely superfluous or even render its employment in a contrary direction necessary, lest the wagon and its load and the horses themselves be hurried to destruction. And this leads us to another series of considerations. The causes concurring in the production of its forward motion are by no means the only causes by which the motion of the wagon is determined. There is a number of agencies which are in conflict with those impelling causes, acting in a contrary direction, tending to retard and finally arrest or even reverse the motion produced by the opposite causes. There is the inertia which must be overcome in setting into motion a body at rest. Gravitation counteracts at a right angle every power acting in a horizontal line, and thus what we call the weight of the wagon and load tends to bring both to a standstill. Friction may retard the motion of the vehicle in various degrees; it is always present, even where it is reduced to a minimum by lubricants or ball-bearings and well paved streets, and is greatly increased by rough roads and creaking axles. The cohesion of clay and its adhesion to the wheels of a loaded wagon may prevail over a span of horses and keep the wagon planted in the road until it can be lifted or dug out of its predicament. And when the road leads up-hill, gravitation, which would concur with the horse-power in propelling the vehicle forward on a down-hill road, now acts as a retarding power of great force and persistence, fighting every inch of the vehicle's progress, and only where the balance of power between the retarding causes and the force applied by the horses is on the latter's side, they will be able to draw the wagon to the top of the hill. If the sum of conflicting powers are equal on both sides, the wagon will stand still. To prevent this, the driver may add his muscular strength to that of the horses by putting his shoulder to the wheel, and thus keep the balance of power in his favor. But should one of the horses or both of them give out on a steep incline, the balance of power may go to

the other side, gravitation may reverse the motion of the wagon and draw it downward even to the foot of the hill, unless the driver succeed in arresting this downward motion, which he may do by applying the brakes to his wheels and thus bringing about another conflict of causes, of friction and gravitation, and counterbalancing the latter by the former. Of course, he cannot propel the wagon up-hill by the brakes; but he can prevent it from moving down-hill until his horses have recovered and he can again pit his horse-power against the power of gravitation and the rest of the retarding causes. It is by the difference between these conflicting powers, with the *plus* on his side, that he will finally reach the top of the hill.

The motion of a wagon is thus seen to be quite a complicated affair, and to ignore this complicity may lead and has often led to serious loss. Many a good horse has been ruined because the driver persistently and brutally acted as if the moving of a wagon loaded with coal, stone, or lumber were determined solely and wholly by the power of his horses, utterly ignoring that to overcome the combined forces of inertia, friction, adhesion and gravitation in the given case was a physical impossibility, and all the more so, the more he weakened his horses by fruitless exertions to perform what was possible only by increasing the propelling force by the addition of another horse, or by diminishing the retarding forces, say the power of gravitation, by hoisting a part of his coal or lumber overboard. But instead of resorting to the one or the other of these measures and then, without unnecessary loss of time and fruitless abuse of his horses, performing his task by the difference of conflicting causes changed in his favor, the teamster will frequently resort to a copious outpouring of profanity and obscenity, as if that could work as a concurrent cause toward moving a coal wagon.

But let many a leader in the social conflicts of to-day beware of throwing stones at that blaspheming teamster.

Driving a coal wagon is a complicated affair; but the labor problem is more so, and mistakes in the management of labor interests must lead to results far more disastrous than the loss of a horse. Yet the great watchword of organized labor and its leaders to-day is, *Labor is the creator of all wealth*. This is an error precisely for the same reason that it is false to suppose the movement of a load of coal determined only by a span of horses. It is not true that labor is the creator of all wealth. Wealth is the product of concurrent causes of which labor is but one, and the production of wealth is determined by the difference of the sum of causes concurring in its production and the sum of the causes retarding its production and preservation. Where the causes of the latter class prevail, no wealth is produced, but loss or a diminution of wealth is the outcome. All the labor in the world by itself cannot produce a particle of wealth, a match or a carpet tack. The labor of an entire year may under adverse circumstances, prove unprofitable. A farmer may plow and sow and cultivate in the sweat of his brow and have little or nothing to reap; or he may even reap and feed his corn into hogs and cattle, and then lose both his hogs and his cattle, or the value of them, and, when the year is around, be possessed of far less wealth than he was a year ago. A mining company may sink a shaft and spend thousands of dollars and, finding no ore or anything else worth taking out, finally abandon the enterprise, having produced no wealth but lost all their investments. But was not the labor of the diggers profitable? Did not they make their wages? No; they may have received them, but certainly did not make them by their labor. If they had, their pay must have come out of the pit in which nothing of value was found. They were paid in wealth produced by others; and to take their pay in what their labor had produced, they must have taken stock in the mine, which was worthless as the mine itself, the entire product of their labor.



The primary causes which work together in the production of wealth are *nature*,<sup>1)</sup> *human labor*,<sup>2)</sup> and *the blessing of God*,<sup>3)</sup> to which must be added *capital*<sup>4)</sup> as a secondary, intermediate, or instrumental cause, whereby the productivity of labor is largely increased. The wood and sulphur and phosphorus in a match are materials which no amount of human labor could produce; they are the contributions of nature. All the forests and sulphur and phosphorus in the world did not constitute a single friction match before human labor took the materials from nature's store and made them into matches. And without the protecting and prospering power of God there could not be a man with ingenuity enough to make matches, nor a factory to make them in, nor a people to pay for them and use them; for in Him we live and move and have our being,<sup>5)</sup> and He upholds all things by the word of His power.<sup>6)</sup> Yet in the face of all this we are told that labor is the creator of all wealth; and this false statement is not only whispered in an unguarded moment, but is loudly proclaimed in declarations of principles; it is in fact the fundamental error and falsehood upon which the theory and practice of industrial organizations are professedly based. Can it be surprising that theory and practice based upon so flagrant a falsehood should lead to dire confusion and endless injustice and infringement of rights? Is it surprising that labor, the purported creator of all wealth, should claim all wealth as its rightful possession, and that discontent and bitter complaints should permeate the masses who deem that withheld from them which their toil is supposed to have created?

---

1) Gen. 1, 28; 2, 15; 3, 23; 4, 2, 22; 6, 14; 9, 20; 10, 9; 26, 12.

2) Gen. 2, 15; 4, 2, 22. Eph. 4, 28. 1 Thess. 4, 11. 2 Thess. 3, 10—12.

3) Ps. 127, 1, 2. Gen. 26, 3 ff. 26. Deut. 16, 15. Prov. 10, 22. Ps. 65, 10—12; 104, 13—27. Deut. 8, 11—14. 27. Hagg. 1, 6, 9—11. Matt. 6, 11. Luke 11, 3. Ps. 146, 15, 16; 104, 27.

4) We reserve the discussion of the significance of capital in industrial production to a later section of this article.

5) Acts 17, 28.

6) Hebr. 1, 3.

The perverseness and injustice of the doctrine that labor is the creator of all wealth will appear with still greater clearness when we remember that labor is but one of several *concurrent* causes in the production of wealth. A concurrent cause is not an independent cause of a part of the products of several causes, but a cause which together with other causes is productive of one joint result of all the causes working together. When A builds a house and B builds another house, A and B are both house-builders, but they are not concurrent causes, and if A builds a good house and B a bad one, A's house is good and B's bad. But when A is a mason and B a carpenter, and both are occupied in building the same house, they are concurrent causes of that house, and the joint product of their work will be what they have conjointly made it. Wealth is the product of nature and labor and the blessing of God concurring in the production of a joint result. Each of these causes is a variable quantity. The output of a mine may be rich in one month and poor in the next month with the same amount of labor applied, simply because the rock blasted in one month was richer in ore or native copper than the rock blasted in the subsequent month. With the same amount of labor a rich crop may be reaped from the same soil from which a scanty crop was reaped the previous year, because God blessed the one year with rain and sunshine in due season, which he withheld in the previous year. Cotton is scarce at one time and plentiful at another. A failure of crops in large districts will affect the farmers, the trades, the railroads, the commerce, the banks, the professions, the schools, especially the higher institutions of learning, throughout and beyond those districts, and the result is a diminution of wealth, not the wealth of the farmers only, but of thousands who never handled a plow and could not tell oats from barley. When, during the civil war in America the production of cotton in the South was suspended, thousands upon thousands of people employed in the manu-

facture of cotton fabrics in England were thrown out of work and suffered intensely for want of the necessities of life. Why? Not because of increased consumption; for consumption is diminished at such times. Nor because of a scarcity of labor power; for at such times labor power is abundant and many hands are idle. Why does not labor make up for the deficiency? Because labor cannot produce independently, but only as a concurrent cause, and when one of the concurrent causes fails, the joint product must suffer. The miller cannot produce more flour than he has grain to grind it from, and to run his mill without anything to grind would result, not in an increase, but in a decrease of wealth. The baker cannot produce wealth in the form of bread without sufficient flour to bake it from, and to operate his bakery and heat his ovens without anything to bake would again result in loss, not in gain, of wealth. A fisher may dip or drag his nets through a pond all day and catch no fish if there are no fish in the pond; he cannot produce wealth without the concurrence of nature. There was an abundance of fish in the lake of Gennesaret; yet Peter with his partners had toiled all the night and taken nothing, because he had not enjoyed what he was granted later, the blessing of God, and the concurrence of nature and divine blessing and honest toil resulted in a great draught of fish. Labor is not the sole producer of wealth; nor is it one of several independent producers, bringing forth certain objects, while other objects were produced by the rest of the likewise independent agents respectively. Labor alone and by itself can produce nothing.

Even the share which labor may claim in the joint product called wealth is not a fixed quantity, because, as has been already remarked, the causes which concur in the production of wealth are not fixed, but variable quantities. No two fields are precisely the same, and there is no possibility of telling precisely, how much of a bushel of wheat in a given case is due to nature and how much to labor.

From no two acres of timber land the same amount of lumber of the same quality can be taken to the same market at the same expense, and there is no possibility of telling how much of the value of a given hundred feet of lumber is due to nature and how much to labor. No ton of copper sold at the market price has been mined and marketed under precisely the same conditions as every other ton sold at the same price, and no individual laborer can determine his proportionate share of the money turned over by the purchaser to the owners of the mine, especially since labor itself is also a variable quantity, and no two laborers can justly claim to have contributed precisely the same amount toward the production of a given ton of copper or of its market value. In short, it is simply impossible to determine with accuracy the share which any human individual or his labor has had as a concurrent cause in the production of a given value as a joint effect.

But an effect is not only determined by its concurrent causes, but also by contrary agencies counteracting the productive causes and retarding or even frustrating the effect. The wheels of industry move under an immense amount of friction, and much, perhaps most of the work of production is up-hill work. Dangers of land and sea, damage by fire and water and wind, theft and defraudation, natural and forced fluctuations of the market, the influence of politics, international complications, and other causes, not the least of which are certain measures of industrial warfare, work together in counteracting the causes of production. By such adverse causes, large industries may be brought to a standstill, or even reverse the direction of their wheels. Manufacturing and other enterprises may work with little or no profit, even with serious loss, and end in bankruptcy at the foot of the hill. Profit and loss, success and failure, and their various degrees, are determined by the difference of conflicting causes. Where the two sides are equally balanced, there is standstill, neither increase nor decrease

of wealth. But the equipoise is never of long duration. Besides, it is frequently impossible to estimate the conflicting causes, and the struggle assumes the character of a game of chance, where no party knows what cards the other holds or intends to play, and dishonest dealings and bluffs are oftentimes resorted to. Under more favorable circumstances the various industrial factors can be approximately computed; but only approximately, and the omission of one factor, no matter on what side of the problem, will vitiate the computation to the extent of the importance of the factor omitted. What then are we to expect of a solution based upon one factor only, omitting all the rest? If labor is the creator of all wealth, then it is a matter of course that labor should decide all industrial questions and form the standard of all industrial interests. And this is precisely what the trade unions of our day maintain. They presume to dictate the rate of wages, the hours of labor, the material to be used, the men to be employed, the markets to be supplied, the means of transportation, and whatever else they may deem it proper or possible to control in the interest of labor. Let the employer refuse to accept a scale of wages prescribed by a trade union, and the men will strike. Let him decline the eight hour day, and they will strike again. Let him insist upon using stone or brick tabooed by the union, and they will strike once more. Let him employ a "scab," and the walking delegate will call out the union men to strike. Let him ship over a railroad proscribed by the union, and he must face a strike. Quite recently Illinois coal miners prohibited the sale of coal to Missouri at the penalty of a strike because of a difficulty between miners and operators west of the Mississippi. A witness before the Royal Commission in England gave the following occasions of strikes. 1. Advance in one degree or other of wages. 2. Reduction of hours. 3. Objection to foremen. 4. Objection to non-Union men. 5. Objection to Union men in arrears to the Union. 6. Objection to work



receiving extra wages for efficiency. 7. Objection to machine work. 8. Objection to work imported from other districts of the country, such as quarry-worked stone. 9. Objection to machine-made bricks and bricks made by non-Union men. 10. Objection to Clerk of Works taking plumb-line in his hand to try if a wall be plumb, the Unionists contending that they have the right to use the plumb-line, and that the Clerk of Works has the right only to look on. 11. Objection to the number of apprentices. 12. Objection to two ladders, one for laborers to ascend and the other to descend. 13. Objections to piece-work. 14. Refusing to allow tile or brick floors by any but brick-setters. 15. Objections by laborers to the employer appointing his own foreman. *Et cetera*. The inquiry further showed that Unions had prescribed "that all bricks must be carried in a hod, and no bricks carried in a wheel-barrow, and the number of bricks in a hod must not exceed a limited number." In all this the Unions are only consistent with their ruling principle that labor is the creator of all wealth. If they are the producers, why should they not dictate the means and methods of production? The disregard of employers by the Unions was asserted by Mr. Connolly, of the Operative Stonemasons, before the Royal Commission thus: "We do not take masters into account at all in our arrangements."<sup>1</sup>) Of course not. And the consumer? Let him too take care of himself. Production is one thing and consumption is another. If the contractor must pay higher wages for shorter hours, he need not be the loser; let him put a profit on what he pays to his men, and let the owner for whom the house is being built pay the cost.

That such theory and practice must lead to and implies gross injustice is all the more apparent in view of the modern methods of production in the manufacturing industries in which the great masses of workmen are employed. In

1) Q. 1349.

earlier centuries, the shoemaker, though he was not the creator of boots and shoes, but added his labor to the materials he had not produced and could not produce, yet contributed far more toward the production of a pair of shoes than a workman in a modern shoe factory. As a rule, the shop was his own, so were the tools, so was the leather, and so was the customer; and if the customer was not satisfied and refused to pay for the shoes, the loss was his. Nowadays, the employer furnishes the shop, the material, the tools and machinery; he must see that he finds a market for the product of manufacture, and suffer the loss if the goods remain on his hands or payment is withheld or inadequate. But even in the face of all this, the employees of a shoe factory will play the part of creators of all wealth, will dictate to the employers whom they shall employ in their factory, put at their machines and to handling their materials, what wages they shall pay, how many hours their machinery shall run, and if their demands are not complied with, they will not only refuse to work themselves, but do what is in their power to prevent others from working in an establishment over which they have no rightful control and in which they have no interest save one, the opportunity of securing the greatest amount of wages for the least amount of labor. "The action of unions," says an English jurist, "so far as it excludes non-unionists from work, and requires for unionists wages to a certain amount, is founded on a supposed monopoly of a given kind of work in a given district. All such work is assumed to be the property of the union: if all the workmen who can supply the work are in the union, the monopoly is secured; and the usual action has been to increase wages and decrease work until a maximum amount of wages has been extracted from the employers, and the equal distribution of the minimum amount of work secured for each member."<sup>1)</sup>

---

1) The law relating to Trade Unions, by Sir William Erle, formerly Chief Justice in the Common Pleas. London 1869, p. 45.

That this practice of disposing of other people's labor and other people's capital is an unjust infringement of other people's rights is manifest even in the light of reason and natural morality. "Every person," says the same author, "has a right under the law, as between him and his fellow subjects, to full freedom in disposing of his own labor or his own capital according to his own will. It follows that every other person is subject to the correlative duty arising therefrom, and is prohibited from any obstruction to the fullest exercise of this right which can be compatible with the exercise of similar rights by others."<sup>1</sup>)

This doctrine has found its application in the courts of this country, and the dicta of judges defining the law and its principles are very explicit.

In *State v. Stewart* 59 Vt. 273, Judge POWERS of the Supreme Court said, "In England and here, it is lawful, and it may be added, commendable, for any body of men to associate themselves together for the purpose of bettering their condition in any respect, financial or social. . . . But while the law accords this liberty to one, it accords a like liberty to every other one; and all are bound to so use and enjoy their own liberties and privileges as not to interfere with those of their neighbors. . . . To-day in England as here, workmen stand upon the same broad level of equality before the law with all other vocations, professions or callings whatsoever, respecting the disposition of their labor and the advancement of their associated interests. There, as here, it is unlawful for employers wrongfully to coerce, intimidate or hinder the free choice of workmen in the disposal of their time and talents. There, as here, it is unlawful for workmen wrongfully to coerce, intimidate or hinder employers in the selection of such workmen as they choose to employ. There, as here, no employer can say to a workman he must not work for another employer,

---

1) Ibid. p. 12.

nor can a workman say to an employer he cannot employ the service of another workman.

"By the law of the land these respondents have the most unqualified right to work for whom they please, and at such prices as they please. By the law of the land, O'Rourke and Goodfellow have the same right. By the same law the Ryegate Granite Company has the right to employ the respondents or O'Rourke on such terms as may be mutually agreed upon, without let, hindrance or dictation from any man or body of men whatever.

"Suppose the members of a bar association in Caledonia county should combine and declare that the respondents should employ no attorney, not a member of such association, to assist them in their defense in this case, under the penalty of being dubbed a 'scab' . . . would the respondents look upon this as an innocent intermeddling with their rights under the law? . . .

"If such conspiracies are to be tolerated as innocent, then every farmer in Vermont, now resting in the confidence that he may employ such assistance in carrying on his farm as he thinks he can afford to hire, is exposed to the operation of some secret code of law, in the framing of which he had no voice, and upon the terms of which he had no veto, and every manufacturer is handicapped by a system that portends certain destruction to his industry. If our agricultural and manufacturing industries are sleeping upon the fires of a volcano, liable to eruption at any moment, it is high time our people knew it."<sup>1</sup>) And further on the same Judge says, "The exposure of a legitimate business to the control of an association that can order away its employees and frighten away others that it may seek to employ, and thus be compelled to cease the further prosecution of its work, is a condition of things utterly at war with every principle of justice, and with every safeguard of protection

---

1) American Reports, Vol. 59, pp. 712 f.

that citizens under our system of government are entitled to enjoy.”<sup>1)</sup>

In *Old Dominion Steamship Company v. McKenna*, BROWN, J., said: “. . . Associations have no more right to inflict injury upon others than individuals have. All combinations and associations designed to coerce workmen to become members, or to interfere with, obstruct, vex or annoy them in working or in obtaining work because they are not members, or in order to induce them to become members, or designed to prevent employers from making a just discrimination between the wages paid to the skillful and to the unskillful, to the diligent and to the lazy, to the efficient and to the inefficient, and all associations designed with the perfect freedom of employers in the proper management and control of their lawful business, or to dictate in any particular the terms upon which their business shall be conducted by means of threats of injury or loss, by interference with their property and traffic, or with their lawful employment of other persons, or designed to abridge any of these rights, are *pro tanto* illegal combinations or associations; and all acts done in furtherance of such intentions by such means and accompanied by damage are actionable.”<sup>2)</sup>

In *State v. Glidden* Sup. Ct. Conn. Apr. 1. 1887 it was held that a “boycott,” as that term is used by organizations or laboring men in this country, is a conspiracy at common law, and the means by which it is in general sought to be accomplished are not only unlawful, but in some degree criminal. CARPENTER, J., said, among other things: “Now if we look at these transactions as it appears in the face of this information, we shall be satisfied that the defendants’ purpose was to deprive the Carrington Publishing Company of its liberty to carry on its business in its own way, although in doing so it interfered with no right of the defendant. The

1) Ibid. p. 716.

2) 59 Am. Rep. 721.



motive was a selfish one, to gain an advantage unjustly and at the expense of others, and therefore the act was legally corrupt. As a means of accomplishing the purpose the parties intended to harm the Carrington Publishing Company, and therefore it was malicious. It seems strange in a country in which law interferes so little with the liberty of the individual, that it should be necessary to announce from the bench that every man may carry on his business as he pleases, may do what he will with his own so long as he does nothing unlawful and acts with due regard to the rights of others. . . . If the defendants have the right which they claim, then all business enterprises are alike subject to their direction. No one is safe in engaging in business, for no one knows whether his business affairs are to be directed by intelligence or ignorance, whether law and justice will protect the business, or brute force regardless of law will control it; for it must be remembered that the exercise of the power, if conceded, will by no means be confined to the manner of employing help. . . .

“Again, if the alleged right is conceded to the defendants, a similar right must be conceded to the promoters of the Carrington Publishing Company, and those with whom they may associate. Otherwise all men are not equal before the law. It logically follows that they in turn may control the business matters of the defendants, may determine what trade or occupation they may follow, whether to work in this establishment or in that or in none at all. Obviously such conflicting claims in the absence of law can lead to but one result, and that will be determined by brute force. It would be an instance of the survival not necessarily of the fittest but of the strongest. That would be subversive not only of all business, but also of law and of the government itself. The end would be anarchy pure and simple.”<sup>1)</sup>

And again: “Neither will these defendants be permitted to advance their material interests or otherwise better their

---

1) 59 Am. Rep. 722 ff.

condition by any such reprehensible means. They had a right to ask the Carrington Publishing Company to discharge its workmen and employ themselves, and to use all proper arguments in support of their request. But they had not the right to say, 'you shall do this or we will ruin your business.' Much less had they a right to ruin its business. In such a case the direct and primary object must be regarded as the destruction of the business. The fact that it is designed as a means to an end, and that end in itself considered a lawful one, does not divest the transaction of its criminality."<sup>1</sup>)

In *People v. Fisher*, 14 Wend. 10; s. c. 28 Am. Dec. 501, a conspiracy of Journeymen workmen to raise their wages by entering into a combination to coerce journeymen employed in the same trade, to conform to rules established by such combination for the purpose of regulating the price of labor, and carrying such rules into effect by overt acts, was held indictable. In *Master Stevedores' Association v. Walsh*, 2 Daly 1, 3, it was said: "Convictions in this country have been in cases where coercive measures were resorted to, either to prevent master workmen from engaging below certain rates, or to intimidate journeymen from engaging below certain rates, or to compel them to become members of the combination. Every man has the right to fix the price of his own labor, to work for whom he pleases, and for any sum he thinks proper; and every master workman has equally the right to determine for himself whom he will employ, and what wages he will pay. Any attempt by force, threat, intimidation or other coercive means to control a man in the fair and lawful exercise of these rights is therefore an act of oppression, and any combination for such a purpose is a conspiracy."

In *Johnston Co. v. Meinhart* 9 Abb. N. C. 363; 24 Hun, 489 60 How. Pr. 168, the court said: "If he compels by assault or violence, by threats, by acts of coercion, a fellow-

---

1) 59 Am. Rep. 725.

craftsman to leave the employment of another, he commits an offense against the rights of such persons which is hardly distinguishable from an act which could itself injure or destroy the product of a man's labor. It is a direct injury to property rights."

In *State v. Donaldson*, 32 N. J. L. 151, it was held that it was an indictable conspiracy for several employees to combine and notify their employer that unless he discharges certain enumerated persons, they will in a body quit his employment, the court saying that "the alleged aim of the combination was unlawful, the effort being to dictate to the employer whom he should discharge from his employment, and that this was an unwarrantable interference with the conduct of his business."

In *Moque Steamship Co. v. Macgregor*, boycotting was shown to be actionable when private and particular damage is in evidence. In another boycotting case, *Baughman v. Richmond Typographical Union*, Judge WELLFORD said: "The declaration does not allege damage merely by the prevention of a probable future trade, but by the destruction of an existing profitable trade. . . . The circular of the defendants addressed every customer as a patron, and clearly contemplated his withdrawal of his dealing with the plaintiffs as an immediate damage to their business."

In a criminal case against the committee of the Richmond Typographical Union, decided in 1887, Judge ATKINS said: "Has any man, or set of men, the legal right to say to an American citizen: Do as we dictate, or we will ruin you? The enjoyment of life and liberty with the means of acquiring and possessing property is one of the inherent rights guaranteed to every citizen of this commonwealth by the bill of rights. The privileges cannot be taken away or abridged except in accordance with law. No class of men can take the law into their own hands."

In *Payne v. Railroad Co.* 13 Tenn. 521, it was held that "if the defendants, by means of threats and intimi-

dation, have driven away plaintiff's customers and thus destroyed his trade, they have injured him by an unlawful act, and are liable to him in damages, whether they did it wickedly and maliciously or not."<sup>1)</sup>

And now we ask, is it right for a Christian to identify himself with principles and practices which are so many blows into the face of right and justice before God and man alike? Is it consistent that a Christian should pray to his Father which is in heaven, "Give us this day our daily bread," and at the same time endeavor to secure his daily bread on a principle and by methods based upon a principle which must inevitably lead to the curtailment or exclusion and denial of the rightful claims of others? *Woe unto him that increaseth that which is not his! how long? and to him that ladeth himself with thick clay,*<sup>2)</sup> says the Lord. One of the fundamentals of all human justice is, *Sic utere tuo, ut non laedas alienum*, i. e., Use that which is yours so as not to violate that which is another's. Is it right for a Christian to be with those who in industrial life know of no interests but their own and utterly and by principle disregard the rights and lawful interests of others? There can be but one answer to these questions, and that is an emphatical *No!*

A. G.

(To be concluded.)

## A FORM FOR THE ORDINATION OR INSTALLATION OF A MINISTER.

Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ said unto his disciples, Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have committed unto you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. And when he had ascended far above

1) 59 Am. Rep. 730.

2) Habak. 2, 6.

all heavens, that he might fill all things, he gave unto his church some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.

And whereas the Archbishop of his church has given unto this present congregation a (another) pastor and teacher, it is meet and right that we should hear and ponder what the Lord by his apostle inculcates upon his ministers concerning their holy office.

Thus says St. Paul:

This is a true saying. If a man desireth the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also. But lay hands suddenly on no man. For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre, but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate, holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayer.—And again: A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre, but patient, not a brawler, not covetous, one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; not a novice, lest being puffed up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil. Be thou an example of the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity. Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of



the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all. Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the work of truth. Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.

And whereas you, dearly beloved brother in Christ, have accepted the call extended to you by this congregation, and are about to enter upon the performance of the duties enjoined upon you through such call in accordance with the word and will of the Lord most High, I now ask you in the presence of Omniscient God and of this congregation,

Do you believe the canonical books of the Old and the New Testament to be the inspired word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice?

Answ. I do so believe.

Do you hold and profess the doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran church as laid down in the Symbols contained in the Book of Concord of 1580, especially, the three Ecumenical Creeds, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology of the same, the Smalcald Articles, the Small and the Large Catechism, and the Formula of Concord, to be the true doctrine of the Holy Scriptures?

Answ. I do so hold and profess.

Are you determined faithfully to discharge the duties of the holy ministry in this congregation in full accordance with the Holy Scriptures and the said Symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran church?

I have so determined by the grace of God.

The ordinand will here kneel, and the ordinator, laying his hands upon him, will say:—

Let us pray.

Lord Jesus Christ, who art the Chief Shepherd and the only Head of thy church, we pray thee that thou wouldst

keep thy servant in thy holy word and the sound doctrine therein set forth; that thou wouldst strengthen him in the faithful performance of the duties of the ministry in this congregation, and bless his labors in thy service, that thy holy name may be glorified and thy kingdom be enlarged here and hereafter, who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Ghost, one God for ever and ever, world without end. Amen.

Hereupon the assisting ministers will, each in his turn, lay his hands upon the ordinand and say: —

The mountains shall depart and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee. Amen.

Or,

Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy one of Israel, I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldest go. Amen.

Or,

The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil; he shall preserve thy soul. The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth, and even for evermore. Amen.

Or,

Be strong and of good courage; fear not, nor be afraid; for the Lord thy God, he it is that doth go with thee; he will not fail thee, nor forsake thee. Amen.

Or,

Thus saith the Lord, Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing. Amen.

Or,

Be not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.

Or,

Be fervent in spirit; serving the Lord; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer.

Or,

Be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as you know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord.

Or, some other appropriate text not already embodied in this form.

The ordinator will now continue.

Go, then, take heed unto yourself and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you an overseer, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. Feed the flock of Christ, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; not as being lord over God's heritage, but being an ensample to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, you shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away. The Lord bless you from on high, and make you a blessing unto many, that you may bring forth fruit, and that your fruit may remain unto eternal life.

The Lord bless you and keep you;

The Lord make his face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you;

The Lord lift up his countenance upon you and give you peace. Amen.

A. G.

---

## SKETCH OF A MISSIONARY SERMON ON 1 PET. 2, 11—20.<sup>1)</sup>

Theme: TO MANIFEST THEIR FAITH BY THEIR WALK AND  
THUS WIN OTHERS FOR CHRIST—THE FOREMOST MIS-  
SIONARY DUTY OF CHRISTIANS.

How is this duty to be fulfilled?

I. *Abstain from Fleshly Lusts.*

II. *Have your Conversation Honest among the Gentiles.*

Introduction: We are celebrating a mission festival. To-day we meditate especially over the deplorable lot of such as still sit in the darkness and shadow of death. Throughout the year, it is true, we are reminded of the sad condition of unbelievers. For as often as we consider what we have become through the grace of God: Christians, children of God, heirs of eternal life, so often also do we think of times past when we "were without Christ, . . . having no hope, and without God in the world" (Eph. 2, 12), so often do our thoughts wander also to them who are still far from the kingdom of God. But to-day the principal thought dwelt upon is the deplorable condition of such as are dead in trespasses and sins.

And of whatever phase of mission work we may speak—of home mission or foreign mission, of mission among the Jews, or among the negroes, or among the heathen, etc.,—we are confronted with the image of him who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, and to whom we should show mercy as did the good Samaritan. (Luke 10, 30 ff.)—The purpose of this festival is to remind ourselves emphatically of our Christian duty to dispel the darkness and shadow of death as much as lies in our power and to set the light of the Gospel upon the candle-stick. That is mission work.—But, my friends, when speaking of mission work we must not draw the circle of our vision too

---

1) This sketch is a practical supplement to the exegetical treatise on pp. 67 ff. by the same contributor. ED.

large. Perhaps the majority of people hearing of mission work allow their thoughts to wander to the heathen in distant lands, to the land of the Filipinos, to China, Japan, etc., perhaps also to the Far West of our own country, or to the sunny South. Hence they imagine to have fulfilled their mission duty for a whole year by dropping their contribution into the alms bag.—That is an erroneous conception!—What is mission work essentially? To bring people to the knowledge of the truth. Hence wherever there are such as are still without hope in this world, there you are to fulfill your mission duty. But such people we do not only find in China, in Japan, in India, etc., not only in the Far West of our country or in the sunny South, but also in our next neighborhood, in this our own city. Towards these you are to do your duty. “Well,” some one may think, “what is the preacher driving at? We support a parochial school, in which our children are brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. We maintain a church in which the Word of God is taught in all its truth and purity. Whoever will may come.”—All well and good! But is it not possible that although you help in supporting school and church, although you contribute to the mission fund annually, you yourself may act as a barrier shutting out others from heaven? May you not be the cause that others decry Christianity as hypocrisy? Of the Word of God we say and sing:

“Thy Word doth move the inmost heart,  
 Thy Word doth perfect health impart,  
 Thy Word my soul with joy doth bless,  
 Thy Word brings peace and blessedness.”

This Word works faith in us. And this faith, as Luther says, “is a divine work in us, which changes us and regenerates us of God, and mortifies the Old Adam, making us quite different persons in heart, mind, disposition, and in all our faculties, and brings with itself the Holy Ghost. Oh, this faith is a living, active, efficacious, powerful prin-



ciple. It does not ask whether good works are to be done, but before it asks, they are already done, and it is always a-doing."

Since this is true the change faith has wrought in you must be observable in your daily walk. Thus the unbeliever rightly concludes. Hence you are to conduct yourself as to make the non-Christian confess: The religion of the Christian truly has the power to bring about a change of heart and life. And to lead such a conversation is your foremost missionary duty.—In the present text Peter inculcates this duty.

*The foremost Missionary Duty of Christians: — to Manifest their Faith by their Walk and thus Win others for Christ.*

#### I. Abstain from Fleshly Lusts.

Peter addresses this epistle to the "elect strangers" (1, 1. 2). Why are they called strangers? *Strangers*—their earthly condition; *elect*—their spiritual condition.—Their dignity set forth, 2, 9. 10. Then follows v. 11 of our text. Statement of connection. Explanation of v. 11, showing incompatibility of being a pilgrim and stranger and still living in fleshly lusts, culminating in the assertion "they war against the soul." Application: We too are "elect strangers," we too are surrounded by "Gentiles." The ways of the world the same as of yore: "The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, the pride of life."—"Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we are dead."—Our flesh totally corrupt. Great danger of losing the soul. Demas returned to the world and many are his followers. Terrible thought this—to lose the soul.

But the thought we wished to emphasize especially to-day: The unbelievers know that we glory in being "strangers and pilgrims;" they know from hearsay of the great power we ascribe to the Word. They do not read the Bible, they read you, your lives. Do you live as a pilgrim in this world? If you think, speak, act as do the children of the world; if

you attend theaters, dances, and balls as they do; if they perceive no essential difference between themselves and you, whose fault is it if they regard Christians as evil-doers, as hypocrites? — “The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you.” (Rom. 2, 24.) Up, fellow-pilgrim, know your calling! Through the grace of God prove by your walk that your treasure is in heaven. — But a still more urgent reason to manifest our faith, etc.

II. Have your conversation honest among the Gentiles.

What is the meaning of these words? Summary statement. — The text indicates that the Christians were reviled as *evil-doers*. Historical explanation. How were they to conduct themselves in view of these accusations? “Have your conversation,” etc. — Exemplifications: How they were to conduct themselves as citizens (cf. vv. 13—17), how as servants (vv. 18—20). Purpose: “that . . . glorify God.” Application: Christians to-day are spoken against as “evil-doers.” — One Judas casts reproach upon the other Eleven. — “Christians are hypocrites!” — Even the Son of God was spoken of as an evil-doer, — a winebibber, a deceiver. Nevertheless we should do all in our power “to silence the ignorance of foolish men.”

The idol of to-day is the “almighty dollar.” Do not worship it. — Matt. 6, 19—34. — Our age one of revelry, debauchery, and unchastity. — Of us it should be said: “They think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot” (1 Pet. 4, 4). This Christian life is a confession of our faith in Christ and a powerful object sermon for the “Gentiles,” the non-Christians. Thus you are a true missionary of God, you further God’s kingdom and destroy that of the devil. —

Though we should do all we can to publish the Gospel abroad and at home, we must not neglect this our foremost duty. — To this end may God indelibly inscribe upon our hearts and minds the words of Peter: 1 Pet. 2, 11. 12.

L. W.

## Theological Review.

---

**Gospel Sermons.** COUNTRY SERMONS, VOL. III. *By F. Kuegele, Author of Book of Devotion, Your Confirmation Vow, etc. Augusta Publishing Company, Crimora, Va. 1899. viii and 376 pages. Price, \$1.00.*

The author of these sermons is not a stranger among our readers. But if he were, this volume would not fail to secure for him a cordial recognition among us as a preacher of righteousness, sound to the core in point of doctrine, laying down the law and the gospel from and according to the text, and applying both according to the wants of the congregation, always knowing and letting others know what he is about. The author has not broken or drifted away from what he was accustomed to hear and to say before he was called to his present environments, but preaches the old truths from the old texts in the old traditional way to which we have been accustomed in those quarters of the Lutheran church in which the greatest number of sound sermons have been preached for the last fifty years.

A. G.

---

**American Lutheran Almanac and Year-Book, 1900.** *American Publication Board, Pittsburg, Pa. 104 pages. Price, 10 cents.*

The reading matter contained in this annual, a biography of Dr. Walther by C. L. Janzow, with a well printed portrait of Walther and a fine picture of Concordia Seminary, is worth the price of the book many times over. The registers of ministers and school teachers are substantially the same as those contained in the German Almanacs of the Synodical Conference.

A. G.

---

**Life of Rev. Prof. C. F. W. Walther, D. D.** *By C. L. Janzow.*  
*American Lutheran Publication Board, Pittsburg, Pa.*  
Price, 25 cents.

This is a separate edition of the biography contained in the Almanac above mentioned, but more largely leaved, printed on heavier paper, and provided with a more substantial cover, all of which makes it quite a stately book in good keeping with its stately contents. May it find a correspondingly wide circulation. A. G.

---

**The Lutheran Cyclopaedia.** *Edited by Henry Eyster Jacobs, D.D., LL.D., and Rev. John A. W. Haas, B.D., with the co-operation of Professor C. Zöckler, University of Greifswald, and other European scholars and representative scholars from the various Synods.*  
vii and 572 pages. Price, \$4.00.

The oldest work extant which embodies what might be called a Theological Cyclopaedia was written by one man, Isidore of Seville, the most learned man of his time. In this work, entitled *Libri Originum s. Etymologiarum XX*, the author gives, in the form of brief definitions or descriptions, the elements, sum and substance of all the various sciences or provinces of human knowledge in his day, Grammar, Rhetoric, Logic, Arithmetic, Geometry, Music, Astronomy, Medicine, Jurisprudence, Theology, Politics, Natural History, Geography, Sociology, Agriculture, War, Navigation, Architecture, *et cetera*. Theology is chiefly dealt with in Books VI, VII, and VIII, comprising forty-four chapters and 959 paragraphs. The subjects are mostly either historical or doctrinal, and the author's aims throughout have been clearness and brevity.

Side by side with this oldest Cyclopaedia we have before us the most recent work of the same class in theological literature, *the Lutheran Cyclopaedia*. There, a cyclopaedia of all the sciences by one author, who writes to his friend

Braulio that, according to his promise, he had written him a work on the Origin of a few things, gathered from the remembrance of what he had read in former days.<sup>1)</sup> Here, a cyclopedia of Lutheran theology only, but the work of upwards of 180 contributors selected for their special familiarity with the subjects allotted to them respectively, subjects most of which are of comparatively recent date and originated or transpired in parts of the earth which for centuries to come were howling wildernesses in the days when Isidore penned his *Origines*. But while the Cyclopedia of Isidore is to-day a curiosity known to few and of little use even to them, this modern Cyclopedia of Lutheran theology is a storehouse of valuable information which can not be supplanted by any work now in existence, or by any number of books within the mental grasp of any man living, and may be used to great advantage by many who have larger cyclopedias at hand. The work is not in all its parts what we would wish to see it. Some of the doctrinal articles are unsound, and some of the historical articles are untrue. But it is the best book of its kind in the market and a very serviceable book as far as it goes. It is not a general cyclopedia of theology, but a book of reference on subjects pertaining or related to the Lutheran church, its history, doctrine, and practice. The biographical sketches are chiefly lives of Lutheran theologians. There is no article on Athanasius or Basil the Great or Thomas Aquinas or John Wesley, but Schmucker and Krauth, Hartwig and Hazelius, Walther and Wyneken and Craemer and Buenger, are in line at their places in the Alphabet. The work is particularly rich in detailed information on the Lutheran church in America, its synods, institutions, enterprises, literature, and statistics.

A. G.

---

1) *En tibi, sicut pollicitus sum, misi opus de Origine quarundam rerum ex veteris lectionis recordatione collectum.*

---



**Eucharist.** *The voice of the Scriptures and church History concerning the Lord's Supper.* By Ernst Gerfen, Ev. Luth. Pastor, Union City, Ind. Author of "Baptizein," etc. Columbus, Ohio: Press of Lutheran Book Concern. 1899.—253 pages.

If the manuscript of this book had been put through a winnowing process properly performed before the work went into print, the task of the reviewer would be more pleasant than it is. We have reason to believe that the author would have been willing and ready to change many of his statements if his attention had been called to their incorrectness in due time. It is with sincere regret that we see so much that is well and truly said bound up with so much that will not stand in the light of Scripture or history.

The author's chief purpose has evidently been to meet the principal antitheses whereby the doctrine of the Lord's supper has been assailed by the Romanists on the one hand and by Zwinglians and Calvinists on the other, and in this endeavor he has been in a fair measure successful. Without restriction and compromise he maintains the scriptural doctrine of the real presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the eucharist, and of the efficacy of the sacrament as a means of grace. This testimony is all the more appreciable as there are, especially in our country, many who bear the Lutheran name while they reject the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's supper in all its essential points. But while our author champions the Lutheran cause, his swordmanship is in various ways defective, and his blade is not without flaws. While he operates on diseased theologies, his surgery is not aseptic; his hands and instruments are not as clean as they should be. His doctrinal statements are not in all instances correct, and his historical arguments are not always reliable. The "recitation of the sacramental words" is undoubtedly of the "essence of the sacraments." The church has not "an inner and an external side." That the Sabbath "had to be observed every seventh day" cannot be based

upon Gen. 2, 3. The passover should not "be an ordinance forever, i. e., to the end of time." The *Acta Pilati* should not be adduced in evidence in a historical argument. "As to the question whether unbelievers also receive the body and blood of Christ," an agreement *was* reached at Wittenberg in 1536. Calvin certainly did *not* approach Luther's doctrine on the Lord's Supper. In all this we are at variance with so many statements of our author made in various parts of his book.<sup>1)</sup> There are other points to which we would take exception, but upon which we could not enter without a lengthy argument. We would only add that readers "who by reason of use have their senses exercised" will be amply repaid by a perusal of the book. A. G.

**Auswahl aus Luthers Deutschen Schriften.** Edited with Introduction and Notes by W. H. Carruth, Ph. D., Professor of German Language and Literature in the University of Kansas. Boston, Ginn & Co., Publishers. 1899.—LXXXII and 362 pages. Price, \$1.10.

'The purpose of this book is to render Luther's language intellectually and financially accessible to the Anglo American readers, especially to American college students. "Bearing in mind that the American college student may not read more than one volume of Luther's writings, the editor has taken his selections from the whole course of Luther's life, and chosen as far as possible those writings which have intrinsic literary or historical worth."<sup>2)</sup> Here are the titles of the writings given: *Vorrede zu Ein Deutsch Theologie. Von den guten Werken. An den christlichen Adel. Sendbrief an Papst Leo X. Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen. Aus dem Neuen Testament (Septemberbibel). Von Kaufshandlung und Wucher. Brief an Lucas Crannach. Brief an Franz von Sickingen. Ein Brief von dem*

1) Pp. 18, 27, 39, 64, 87, 211, 212.

2) Preface, p. III.

*aufrurischen Geist. Geistliche Lieder. An die Radherren. Brief von einem hübschen, lustigen Garten. Aus den Fabeln. Eine Predigt, dass man Kinder zur Schulen halten solle. Gedanken von der Musica. Ueber Musik. Wider Hans Worst. Aus dem Alten Testament. Brief an seine Hausfrau.* Several of the longer numbers are printed with omissions, but "enough is given to outline the whole."<sup>1)</sup> The introduction is, in the main, a biography of Luther as an author, and the notes are chiefly linguistic, and both reflect credit on Prof. Carruth's ability and painstaking application. Even the statement of the Sacramentarian controversy is correct in nearly every point, which is more than can be said of the treatment this subject has, as a rule, received at the hands of modern theologians. Of course, the word consubstantiation is out of place in this connection: "Luther's doctrine was that the actual body of Christ was present with the bread in the sacrament (consubstantiation), as opposed to the Catholic view that the bread was changed into his body, while Zwingli taught that the bread was only a memorial and symbol of the body, that is, the sacrifice."<sup>2)</sup> The parenthesis should be eliminated; for Luther's doctrine, as correctly given in the statement, is not that of consubstantiation. — The typographical make-up of the book is exquisite. We hope that the book will be introduced and used in all the Universities and thousands of libraries, public and private, throughout the length and breadth of the Land.

A. G.

**The four Gospels from a lawyer's standpoint, by Edmund H. Bennet, LL. D.** Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1899. — 58 pages; price, \$1.00.

This is an apologetic essay in defense of the credibility of the four Gospels. The first chapter opens with the fol-

1) Ibid.

2) P. LIV.

lowing statements which indicate the general character of the little work.

"It is, as you know, a part of the lawyer's profession to examine and cross-examine witnesses, to detect their errors, and expose their falsehoods; or, on the other hand, to reconcile their conflicting statements, and from seeming discord to evolve and make manifest the real truth. . . . And this paper is the result of an effort, on my own part, to ascertain whether or not, independently of divine revelation, independently of the exercises of devout Christian faith, independently of any appeal to our religious sentiments, the truth of the story told in the four Gospels could be satisfactorily established by a mere reasoning process, and by applying the same principles and the same tests to the Gospel narratives that we observe in determining the truth or falsity of any other documents, or any other historical accounts." <sup>1)</sup>

The book contains many exquisite points made "from a lawyer's standpoint," though the author is not ashamed to declare that he knows of another standpoint from which the Scriptures should be viewed, that of a believing Christian. To some of the solutions of harmonistic difficulties we would take exception for exegetical reasons, also "from a lawyer's standpoint," and the syncretistic preface is not tenable from any legitimate standpoint whatever.

A. G.

**The Self-Interpreting Bible** *with Commentaries, References, Harmony of the Gospels, and the Helps needed to Understand and Teach the Text, Illustrated and Explained by over four hundred Photographs Showing the Places of Bible event as they appear to-day.* In 4 vols., 4°, 2100 pages. References, Explanatory Notes, and Tabulated Statistics edited and revised by Rev. James W. Lee, D. D. Geographical, Historical, and Explanatory Illustrations by Josiah L. Porter, D. D., LL. D. Expository Notes, Dissertations and Side Lights by Henry Cooke, D. D.,

1) P. 1. 2.

L.L. D. References, Reflections, Tabulated Statistics and Comments by John Brown, D. D., L.L. D. Photographs by Prof. Robert E. M. Bain. Subscription price, \$12.00.

A work deserving of the title "Self-Interpreting Bible" is one whose editors have carefully, strictly, and consistently observed the hermeneutic principle, "*Scriptura scripturam interpretatur.*" In the volumes before us we have only a sincere endeavor in this direction, for in numerous instances of expository notes and dissertations we find unscriptural human "side lights" leading away from the truth. A few specimens will make this evident.

"Ps. 51. V. 1. 'According unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions.' The Hebrew title attributes this psalm to David penitentially bowing to the rebuke of Nathan, 2 Sam. XI. etc. Horsley, however, justly observes that this title cannot be correct, as v. 4 describes the sin of the speaker as solely against God, whereas that of David was also against both Uriah and Bath-sheba. Who then is the speaker? The answer lies (1) In comparing Ps. 40, 6 with He. 16, 6, and these with Ps. 51, 16. (2) From considering that, though Christ is certainly [?] the speaker in Ps. 51, he nevertheless confesses the oppression of the '*iniquities laid upon him,*' and in that just sense calls them his own, in correspondence with Ps. 25, 11; 32, 5. (3) That none but Christ could truly utter the perpetual view of sin described (v. 3), 'My sin is *ever* before me'—even the sin of his people which he bore, the defilement of which he *ever* saw, and the pressure of which he *ever* felt."

"V. 5. The *iniquity* and *sin* belonged, by ordinary descent, to the mother; but the 'body prepared' for Christ by the power of the Holy Ghost, Mat. 1, 20, was itself holy, and his spirit filled with truth and wisdom, and his life with righteousness, Heb. 7, 2. 6."

"V. 7. *Hyssop* was employed in sprinkling the blood of the sacrifice in the ceremonial cleansing of the leper, Le. 14, 4—6. Christ by his own blood, 1 Jn. 1, 7, cleansed away our sins, which he '*bore in his own body on the tree,*' 1 Pe. 2, 24."

"V. 13. Though Christ was always a teacher of righteousness, it was not until the '*joy of salvation,*' v. 12, had been *restored* after his resurrection from the dead, that his full qualifications as a Saviour were developed in the conversion of sinners. See Ac. 2, 41."



"V. 14. '*Deliver me from blood-guiltiness.*' Not from the sin of murder committed, but from any guilt that would arise from neglecting to 'declare all the counsel of God' to sinners. See Ac. 18, 6; 20, 26."

Such exegetical work of Prof. Cooke is inconsistent not only with itself, but also with the anonymous "reflections" immediately following. It is inconsistent with itself. For instance, in the notes ad v. 1 the author pictures Christ as pleading with God for the multitude of His tender mercies to blot out the transgressions resting upon the Son of God, and in his notes ad v. 7 he says that Christ by way of sacrifice cleansed away our sins by his own blood. The latter statement is correct. It was not God's *mercy* upon *Christ*, but upon *us*, which took our sins away. Upon *Christ* God executed, according to his divine *justice*, his most terrible wrath, temporal and eternal punishment. Thus it is indeed Christ's bloody sacrifice, without which there is no forgiveness of sins that has saved us, and not a pleading of His for mercy. Neither does the assumption of Christ being the speaker in the 51st Psalm, agree with the following inferences and reflections:

"*Reflections.*—Into what grievous iniquities the best of men, if left to themselves, quickly fall!—but never into any sin from which their gracious God may not recover them. Such as sin publicly ought to take to themselves public shame, for the honor of their God and for a warning to others. Sin is a heavy burden to a penitent soul. It forces from his heart importunate cries for pardoning and purging mercy. And nothing less than promises of mercy can encourage him to pray in faith: and nothing less than merciful pardons and cleansings through Jesus' blood can save him from hell. God's blotting out of sin fixes a penitential remembrance of it, and repeated grief on account of it in the heart of a saint. And a heart truly broken for sin never seeks exculpation, but desires to take all shame and confusion. The exceeding sinfulness of sin lies in its opposition to God's nature and law. And true penitents justify God in all his judgments, however heavy upon them. No person was ever really humbled for sin till brought to see the inward and natural corruption of his heart. It is not outward forms, but inward reality of grace, that God primarily requires; and it is he alone that offers

it to us. He alone must forgive our sins, purging our conscience by the blood of his Son. He alone must sanctify and renew our hearts, pour out his Spirit, restore our joys, and grant us his comfortable presence. What anguish and breaking of soul, loads of guilt, and of sorrow for it, can produce! But God who gives the pardon must also give the comfort of it. Renewed souls count the service of God the most perfect freedom: and the experience of God's remarkable kindness really animates to zeal for his glory, the instruction of others, and the welfare of his church. Broken-hearted penitents viewing themselves as Achans in the camp, are the most earnest wrestlers with God for the happiness of the church. And all the returns of service and praise to God therein must be founded on his special favours, received or secured in Christ and His blood."

The anonymous writer of these reflections evidently has a better conception of the 51st Psalm than Prof. Cooke.

Another specimen, which exhibits the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper:

"*Mat. 24, 26. 'This is my body.'* The Romanists say our Lord spake literally, and that therefore the bread in his supper becomes his literal body. But if so, surely 'the cup' becomes 'the new Testament,' see 1 Cor. 11, 25, for both are equally asserted. But such conversion of the cup the Romanist denies; therefore, with equally valid reason, such conversion of the bread the Protestant rejects. And in this he agrees with the apostle Paul, who thrice declares that what the communicant eats is simply bread, 1 Cor. 11, 26—28. Besides, as our Lord says, Jn. 15, 5, 'I am the vine, ye are the branches'—and yet cannot mean that he was changed into a vine, or his disciples into branches, but merely that he was like the vine, while they were like the branches—so, when he says of bread, 'This is my body,' he means as in the case of the vine, 'this is (like) my body.' For the use of the verb to be, in which it is put for 'to be like, represent, or signify, or answer to,' see Da. 7, 23; 1 Cor. 10, 4; Ga. 4, 24. 25. But if the Romanist still repeat, 'This is my body;' the Protestant replies, 'And so indeed it is—it is his body to faith; for while sense perceives and uses bread, faith discerns and partakes of his body and blood, with all their benefits, to spiritual nourishment and growth in grace.'"

It requires indeed a considerable amount of arrogance to proclaim such gross error to be the doctrine of Protestants in contrast to Romanists, as though *all* Protestants,

even Luther himself, were sharing opinions in this matter with Prof. Cooke.

On the other hand we must also express our joy in regard to other features of the work under consideration. We are indeed pleasantly surprised to find the exposition to the first chapters of the Epistle to the Romans a creditable, clear, and biblical analysis of the scriptural doctrines of justification and sanctification. A specimen in proof thereof is the following:

*"Rom. 3, 19—31. 19.* Now, whatever charges the law of God, manifested in the light of nature or revelation, lays against men, must be extended to all that are under that law, that every man be convinced in his own conscience, that his works are not excusable, far less justifying before God; and that he is chargeable with many crimes, and legally obnoxious to his righteous will. 20. And if the law, by its holy and just commandments, thus charge all men with, and convince them of, sin in their dispositions, thoughts, words, and actions, it is clearly manifest, that none of them in their present state of degeneracy can ever be justified at the awful tribunal of an all-seeing, heart-searching, just, and holy God. 21—23. Nevertheless, this deplorable state of mankind is not desperate; for in the gospel is now clearly manifested that divine righteousness, fulfilled by the Son of God in our nature, which the moral law neither provided nor exhibited, but which has been all along represented in the typical ceremonies and the writings of the Old Testament prophets, as the designed ground of the justification of sinful men; even the righteousness of our divine Redeemer, which he wrought as our Saviour, consisting in his holiness of human nature, obedience of life, and satisfactory sufferings and death, in our stead; which being freely offered in the gospel, to all men, and by faith received by, all who will, weak or strong, Jews or Gentiles—all of them having lost his image, and being incapable of glorifying him, recommending themselves to his favour, or procuring any title to the enjoyment of him. 24—26. And all of them have their sins pardoned, their persons accepted, and are entitled to eternal life, merely by the ever gracious and tender love of God, without any desert of their own, but only on account of that infinitely valuable eternal sacrifice which Jesus Christ endured through his infinite obedience and sufferings, which is lodged in him as an inexhaustible fund of merit to be offered to them; and which God, from his love to them, accepted as their ransom, and offers to all who will, and enables them to receive



through faith in his Son.—Him in his eternal compassion and infinite love, he delightfully set apart as a fit Mediator between God and man, and has clearly manifested and exhibited in the types and predictions of the Old Testament, in his incarnation and public ministry, and in the declarations and offers of the gospel as a propitiatory and reconciling sacrifice, on account of which every one that believes therein may have free access to God. Herein he demonstrates the glory of his own justice, and the perfection of that righteousness of Christ which he offered freely and gladly for the sins of the whole world; and through this he was honoured in pardoning the Old Testament offences before the incarnation, as well as in now pardoning the Gentiles who had long continued in their sins, and in freely justifying everyone, Jew or Gentile, who, however guilty in himself, by faith receives and depends on Jesus Christ as his only Saviour. 27. 28. And as this doctrine of justification by the free grace of God, through the willing sacrifice of Christ, leaves no room for any man to boast, as if he had either in whole or in part recommended himself to the divine favour, it ought to be openly avowed, for the honour of God and humiliation of men, as a thing most plain and evident, that whatever Jew or Gentile, greater or lesser sinner, is pardoned or accepted by God, obtains this privilege merely through the sacrifice of Christ received by faith, without any dependence on his own good dispositions or works. 29. 30. And it is no less manifest, that now God is, in every saving respect, the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews, and that he justifies men whether circumcised or uncircumcised, upon the ground of the same sacrifice of his Son, and by the same instrumentality of faith. 31. And no less manifest is it, that our believing renunciation of our own works in the matter of justification, and receiving the glorious sacrifice of Christ as the only ground of our pardon and acceptance, are so far from invalidating or setting aside the moral law, that hereby we greatly confirm and approve its authority, regard it as a mean of *conviction*, present it with a complete magnifying fulfilment of all its demands as a *covenant*, and are tenderly influenced and enabled to love, regard, and cheerfully obey it as a *rule of life*."

"*Reflections on Rom. 4.*—The best of men can obtain nothing but emptiness by their own works. But justification through the obedience of Christ opens a door of hope to the most heinous transgressor who receives it by faith. This method at once delightfully secures the highest glory to God and happiness to every believer, &c."

We are furthermore delighted to find, that this "Self-Interpreting Bible" nowhere savors after or advocates, but

strenuously and emphatically opposes, all theories of evolution and higher criticisms. This can be clearly seen from the introductions to the biblical books. Inspiration is spoken of as a prevention from error of any kind. The brief *marginal* notes and parallel passages (in small type) appear to be of high value and largely compiled from similar publications; even Glassius is quoted occasionally. There is connected with this Bible a collection of useful, time-saving tables such as are rarely found in other Bibles, if found at all; here we also find Blackwood's comprehensive Aids to the Study of the Holy Bible, and a treatise on "Christ and His Kingdom in Shadows" by Rev. Charles P. Krauth, D. D., LL. D. A "Complete Index and Concise Dictionary of the Bible" also deserves mention, and, last but not least, the photographer is entitled to considerable credit for the splendid work he has done. Yet, with all these advantages, the book is contaminated with unsound doctrine, and therefore we cannot recommend it to be sold within our congregations by the agents now going about trying to sell the Self-Interpreting Bible. Pastors, especially those who are using the English language, will find the "Self-Interpreting Bible" a book "worth having."

(Contributed by E. B.)

---